MASS. ED53.2:V85

UMASS/AMHERST
312066 0273 8070 8

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT TRAINING COORDINATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS COLLECTION
MAR 06 1989
University of Massachusetts Depository Copy

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education

December 1987

884/421

Massachusetts State Council
on Vocational Education
State House, Room 51
Boston, Ma 02133

Telephone
(617) 727-2499

OFFICERS

Chairman
Robert J. Cahill

Vice-Chair
John T. Mahoney

Treasurer
Gloria J. Williams

Secretary
Michael F. Murphy

MEMBERS

Thomas M. Belton
Evangel J. Bredakis
John A. Jensen
Philip A. Pirrone
Michael J. Savage
Charlotte A. Scott
Harold E. Shively
Laura R. Studen
William M. Swanson, Jr.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT TRAINING COORDINATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education

December 1987

CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ii
Abbreviation Key	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Executive Summary	v
Preface	1
Chapter One: Local Level Findings	4
Section A: Perceptions	6
Section B: Service Delivery and Program Outcomes	22
Section C: Planning Input and Information Exchange	40
Section D: Membership	49
Section E: Benefits and Costs of Coordination	56
Section F: Feasibility/Desirability	58
Chapter Two: Regional Level Findings	68
Chapter Three: State Level Findings	81
Chapter Four: Overview and Discussion	90
Chapter Five: Council Recommendations	102
Appendix A: Survey Participants	
Appendix B: SDA/Voc Ed Relationship Changes	
Appendix C: JTPA Clients Served	
Appendix D: Distribution of JTPA Funds	
Appendix E: Services Voc Ed Supplies JTPA	
Appendix F: Local Level Desired Coordination	
Appendix G: State and Regional Survey Participants	

LIST OF TABLES

Title		Page
Table 1:	Survey Response Rate	5
Table 2:	Characteristics of JTPA/Voc Ed Coordination	7
Table 3:	Extent Current Relationships Reflect Ideal	10
Table 4:	Effectiveness of Current Local Coordination	11
Table 5:	Recent Coordination Efforts or Changes	11
Table 6:	Most Encouraging Factors	14
Table 7:	Most Discouraging Factors	18
Table 8:	Title IIA Clients Served by Voc Institutions	23
Table 9:	Title IIB Clients Served by Voc Institutions	23
Table 10:	Cients Served in Public Schools	24
Table 11:	Clients Served with JTPA Funds	25
Table 12:	Institutions Reporting PY '86 JTPA Funds	25
Table 13:	SDA Report of Services Voc Ed Most Often Provided JTPA	26
Table 14:	Voc Ed Report of Services Most Often Provided to JTPA	27
Table 15:	Institutions in Each Contract Mode in PY '86	28
Table 16:	Voc Ed Success Meeting JTPA Performance Standards	29
Table 17:	Voc Ed Success Meeting JTPA Client Needs	30
Table 18:	Eight Percent Funds in PY '85 & PY '86	36
Table 19:	Eight Percent Fund Impact on Local Coordination Quality	38
Table 20:	Perkins Application Review & Coordination Promotion by PICs	41
Table 21:	Voc Ed Participation in PIC Annual Plan	42
Table 22:	Voc Institution Participation in JTPA Planning	43
Table 23:	Provision of Voc Ed Program Listings to PICs	44
Table 24:	Regularity of Voc Ed Inclusion in PIC Mailings	44
Table 25:	Staff Responsible for Coordination	45
Table 26:	Coordination Criteria	46
Table 27:	Benefit from Coordination Technical Assistance	47
Table 28:	Types of Technical Assistance	48
Table 29:	SDA Reports on PIC Membership	50
Table 30:	Voc Ed Reports on PIC Membership	51
Table 31:	Voc Ed Institutions on PIC Committees	53
Table 32:	Voc Ed Advisory Committees with PIC Members	55
Table 33:	Respondents Benefiting from Coordination	56
Table 34:	Most Desirabe Local Coordination Activities	61
Table 35:	Desirability of State Coordination Activities	64

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/vocationaleducatio00mass

ABBREVIATIONS KEY

AFDC	=	Aid for Families with Dependent Children
ALL/VOC	=	Compilation of responses from Secondary and Postsecondary Vocational Education Institutions
CBO	=	Community-Based Organizations
CC	=	Community Colleges
CETA	=	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
CLEECC	=	Cabinet Level Education and Employment Coordinating Council
COMPHS	=	Comprehensive High School with Chapter 74 Occupational Education Programs
CTY/IND	=	City and Independent Vocational Schools, together
DOE	=	Massachusetts Department of Education
EOEA	=	Executive Office of Economic Affairs
ET & E	=	Employment Training and Education
GED	=	General Education Development Certificate (High School Equivalency)
FT	=	Full time work
N	=	Number of responses to particular survey questions
OTEP	=	Office of Training and Employment Policy
PIC	=	Private Industry Council
PT	=	Part time work
PY	=	Program Year
RFP	=	Request for Proposals
RVTS	=	Regional Vocational-Technical Schools (responses include 1 County Agricultural School)
SDA	=	Service Delivery Area (JTPA Adminstrative Entity)
SJTCC	=	State Job Training Coordination Council
VOC ED	=	Vocational Education
VOC/SEC	=	Compilation of responses from all Secondary Vocational Institutions: Regional Vocational-Technical Schools, City and Independent Vocational Schools, Comprehensive High Schools with Chapter 74 Programs and Directors of Occupational Education
Voc-Tech	=	Vocational-Technical
$\bar{X}$.	=	Mean Rating
YCC	=	Youth Coordinating Council

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mary Jo Connelly, former Assistant to the Council, designed and conducted local surveys, conducted regional interviews and wrote Chapters One, Two, Four, and Five.

Dr. Elizabeth Useem of the University of Masssachusetts conducted state-level interviews and wrote Chapter Three. She also consulted on general survey and interview design.

Overall project direction and editing was provided by James Green, former Executive Director of the Council.

Abigail T. Slayton, Acting Executive Director, wrote the Executive Summary and provided final editing.

The Council wishes to thank Dr. Morgan Lewis and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at Ohio State University for consenting to share the survey instrument used for the recently published first annual Report on Vocational Eduation - Job Training Partnership Act Coordination. Dr. Lewis was the primary researcher for this study.

The Council also wishes to thank the vocational and JTPA administrators who took the time to be interviewed or to complete the local survey.

The time and effort of the Leadership Committee as well as Bill Fisher, Dianne Dinger, Frank Llamas and Maria Grigorieff, who reviewed local survey design and instruments, was also greatly appreciated by the Council and its staff.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education studied coordination between the Voc Ed and Employment Training systems. Coordination perceptions and practices were examined at the local, regional, and state levels. The Council hopes this study will further the development of dialogue about coordination between the two systems.

The Study involved an extensive survey of local level service administrators as well as interviews with regional managers and state policymakers at the Department of Education and Executive Office of Economic Affairs. The study assessed:

- institutional commitment to coordination,
- effectiveness of current coordination,
- factors encouraging coordination,
- factors impeding coordination,
- and desired coordination activities.

Commitment and Effectiveness

Most local areas expressed some commitment to coordination, and it is a high priority at DOE and EOEA. All Voc Ed sectors expressed the desire to participate in planning for employment training.

Membership on PIC Boards has been widely perceived as the best channel for participation. However, there are severe practical limitations on Board size. Furthermore, few SDAs, schools, or colleges reported having coordination criteria or staff specifically responsible for coordination activities at the local level. The Voc Ed sector reported that current coordination is largely ineffective, and SDAs reported it only moderately effective.

Regional managers expressed a guarded optimism about the future of coordination. Staff at DOE were somewhat pessimistic about current as well as future coordination efforts, seeing a need for fundamental structural and attitudinal changes in both systems. OTEP regional staff were a little more optimistic about coordination in the future, but expressed reservations about the ability of state policy initiatives to improve local coordination.

State policymakers were largely optimistic about the direction in which coordination is moving and the potential for state leadership to encourage local level coordination. The general consensus was that coordination "has a long way to go," but interagency cooperation and collaboration have improved significantly in the past few years.

Impetus

The factors which local providers reported most encouraged them to coordinate are:

- personal relationships between administrators,
- client needs,
- and state level leadership from the Governor, State Council on Vocational Education, and Youth Coordinating Council.

Scarcity of resources was not among the factors driving local coordination, suggesting that funding cuts alone will not encourage its development. Rather, staff reductions resulting from funding cuts were reported as a barrier to coordination because the time investment necessary for its establishment was not feasible.

Barriers

Local providers reported that the greatest barriers to coordination are:

- turf conflicts,
- difficulty in communicating across systems,
- differences in definitions of allowable services and budget items,
- and the staff and time demands of coordination.

Some examples of the poor communication between the systems at the local level are that SDAs are unaware of the majority of services Voc Ed provides JTPA clients, and many Voc Ed institutions are unaware they could participate in developing proposals for Eight Percent grants.

The fact that JTPA funds cannot be used as a match for Perkins funded activities, but Perkins funds qualify to match JTPA is also a source of frustration to those attempting coordinated activities. This federally mandated impediment could be addressed during the upcoming period of Perkins Act reauthorization. Despite these barriers, there was near unanimity that the benefits of coordination make it well worth the effort.

Desired Activities

Local and regional levels desired the same coordination activities. These are:

- sharing of labor market information,
- reciprocal referrals,
- joint or reciprocal technical assistance,
- and joint program funding.

State, regional, and local levels also were all in agreement that jointly staffed agencies and joint intake, assessment, and evaluation procedures are neither desirable nor feasible for encouraging coordination.

Local administrators desired state level interventions similar to those they desired for the local level. These included:

- sharing labor market planning information,
- technical assistance,
- interagency agreements,
- and joint meetings.

At the state and regional levels, common priorities for coordination were described, including:

- a focus on client need,
- building interagency working relationships,
- resource coordination for specific program initiatives and targeted populations,
- sharing information,
- and developing working models of coordination.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Virtually all visions of effective local coordination at all levels included improved communication, information sharing, and on-going dialogue.

Local service providers are clearly influenced by state policy initiatives and state agency modelling of collaborative behavior. State agencies could support, encourage, and model the prerequisite dialogue necessary for coordination to occur. However, successful coordination requires both state and local level efforts. State policy initiatives and local commitment are both necessary ingredients for effective coordination.

State initiatives to encourage coordination should be designed to cause lasting change at the local level, increasing the capacity of local systems to institutionalize a coordinated planning process.

The Council recommends that DOE and EOEA:

1. Fund local inter-system teams to develop and disseminate coordination resource and training workshop guides;

2. Fund staff positions at the local level with responsibility for linking the systems;

3. Encourage involvement of education committees in local plan development, and develop processess to facilitate on-going local dialogue;

4. Fund development and articulation of open-entry and exit program and support services for JTPA clients;

5. Assist in the alleviation of coordination barriers;

6. Support SDA and Voc Ed information exchange and planning input by encouraging:

   - SDA review of Perkins funding applications,
   - availability of Voc Ed progam listings to SDAs,
   - participation of the Voc Ed sector in development of local employment training plans,
   - and reciprocal review of JTPA and Voc Ed state plans;

7. Encourage broad Voc Ed membership on PIC Boards and Committees and SDA/PIC membership on Voc Ed General and Program Advisory Committees.

PREFACE

For the past year, the Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education has studied coordination between the State and local vocational education (Voc Ed) system and the employment training system funded under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The Council has focused on coordination efforts that involve local Community Colleges (CCs), Regional Vocational-Technical Schools (RVTSs), City and Independent Vocational Schools (CTY/INDs), and Chapter 74 (Massachusetts Voc Ed Law) approved programs in Comprehensive High Schools (COMPHSs) in partnership with JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) and Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). The primary state agencies concerned are: the Massachusetts Department of Education's (DOE) Division of Occupational Education and the Executive Office of Economic Affair's (EOEA) Office of Training and Employment Policy (OTEP).

The main purpose of this study was to further the coordination dialogue which has been emerging between the Voc Ed and JTPA systems at the state level and in many localities. Additionally, the Council is drawing on this work to make recommendations on the adequacy and effectiveness of Voc Ed/JTPA coordination to the Massachusetts Board of Education, the Governor, the Massachusetts Job Training Coordination Council (SJTCC) and the U.S. Secretaries of Education and Labor in fulfillment of evaluation mandates [S.112(d)(9)(A)] of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

Given its limited resources, the Council felt it could best contribute to the coordination dialogue by gatherng data on current perceptions and practices. This information could provide more useful planning information to state and local administrators than a more traditional analysis of JTPA and Perkins requirements and agency objectives. It would also enable the Council to frame more targeted policy recommendations.

From June to September 1987, the Council conducted an intensive survey of secondary and postsecondary Voc Ed administrators and JTPA Directors across the Commonwealth. This survey was a lengthy written questionnaire, with approximately 30 questions requesting both qualitative and quantative data. It had 3 objectives:

1) Collection of baseline information on current local coordination practices, including:

   --joint board and advisory committee membership
   --planning input and information exchange
   --type, quantity and mode of services delivered to SDA/PICs by Voc Ed institutions (CCs, RVTSs, CTY/INDs, and COMPHSs)
   --general self assessment of organizations and program outcomes

2) Comparison of SDA/PIC and Voc Ed institution perceptions of Voc Ed/ JTPA coordination across the Commonwealth, including:

   --desirability/feasibility of coordinating specific services and practices;
   --state and local policies and practices that facilitate or hinder coordination;
   --costs and benefits to institutions of attempted coordination

3) Comment on coordination of state Voc Ed and JTPA systems through:

   --analysis of the adequacy and effectiveness of existing local coordination practices for meeting agency objectives and needs;
   --recommendations for targeting state policy and practices around specific local and state goals.

Survey questions were grouped into six categories: Perceptions of Coordination; Service Delivery and Program Outcomes; Planning Input and Information Exchange; Membership; Benefits and Costs; Feasibility and Desirability. Significant findings from the local survey are reported and interpreted in this topical order in Chapter One.

To help put local level findings in a broader policy context, the coordination study included interviews with regional and state agency staff from DOE and EOEA. Regional interview findings are discussed in Chapter Two. Findings from state level interviews are summarized in Chapter Three.

Chapter Four presents an assessment of the adequacy and effectiveness of current coordination practices for meeting citizens' Voc Ed and employment training needs. It presents analysis of local, regional and state level findings in the context of both present needs and potential future directions for coordination. Chapter Five concludes the report with a set of Council Recommendations for facilitating Voc Ed/JTPA coordination practices at state and local levels.

CHAPTER ONE

LOCAL LEVEL FINDINGS

The design of the local level survey included both questions developed by the Council and questions adapted from a survey instrument of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Approximately one-third of the survey questions were adapted from the instrument used in the National Center's recent study which culminated in its first annual Report on Vocational Education - Job Training Partnership Act Coordination. The National Center's instrument was more sophisticated than the Council would otherwise have been able to access, given staff and time constraints, and offered a comparative framework for analyzing much of this data in a national, as well as local, context.

All survey questions were reviewed and revised by the Council's Leadership Committee (local program operators) before the questionnaire was distributed. The questionnaires were also reviewed at several design stages by Maria Grigorieff of OTEP and Frank Llamas of DOE. The two survey instruments can be obtained from the State Council; because of their length, they were not included in this document.

In June 1987, a set of companion questionnaires--requesting the same kinds of information but directed at the two separate sectors--were sent to Directors of the 15 JTPA SDAs and to administrators of 84 secondary and postsecondary Vocational Education institutions. All 15 CC Presidents, all 26 RVTS Superintendent-Directors, Directors of 17 City and 3 Independent Vocational Schools and 3 County Agricultural Schools were included in the survey, along with a sample of 20 Occupational Education Directors in COMPHSs. Participating institutions are listed in Appendix A.

In September, when analysis began, the survey response rate was 53%, ranging from 50-60% for different sectors (See Table 1).

TABLE 1: SURVEY RESPONSE RATE

Sector	# Requests	# Responses	% Responses	Respondents
SDA	15	8	53%	- Planning Staff - Executive Director - Youth/School Coordinator
CC	15	9	60%	- Academic Dean/Associate
RTVS	29	16	55%	- Supt./Director
CTY/IND	20	10	50%	- Voc Ed Director
COMPHS	20	10	50%	- Occ Ed Director
Total	99	53	53%	

Findings from the local survey furnish baseline information on current local coordination practices. They also offer a comparative local view of Voc Ed and JTPA administrators' concepts of coordination, encouraging and discouraging factors, costs and benefits. They identify local practices and services judged more or less desirable for attempted coordination, as well as state policy measures seen as most and least likely to facilitate local coordination.

SECTION A: PERCEPTIONS OF COORDINATION

To avoid imposing a preconceived definition of coordination, the study's first question asked each respondent to "describe an 'ideal' relationship" between his or her own SDA or Voc Ed institution and the other sector. The matrix in Table 2, on the following page, lists the eight characteristics of the ideal which were noted by respondents from each sector.

Characteristics are marked X if at least one respondent in the sector identified it as part of ideal coordination. X+ is used to indicate elements named by 50% or more of the respondents within a sector. The focus here is on identifying diverging and converging emphases within and across sectors. Yet, the sectoral emphases must be understood in the context of each local JTPA/Voc Ed relationship.

Main headings identify broad areas for institutional coordination which were included in descriptions of 'ideal' Voc Ed/JTPA relationships. Subheadings distinguish different emphases or interpretations of what these coordinating elements would mean in practice.

TABLE 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF JTPA/VOC ED COORDINATION

	CHARACTERISTIC	SDA	CC	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS
1)	Communication	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+
	- Articulation of service goals					X
	- Minimized turf conflicts	X				
	- SDAs informing schools			X		
	- Schools informing PICs			X		
2)	Planning		X	X	X+	X
3)	Nonduplication	X	X			
	- Complementary Activities	X				
4)	Membership Exchange		X	X	X	X
5)	Referrals			X	X	
6)	Programming & Operation	X	X	X	X	X
	- Cooperation on all goals		X		X	
	- All employment training & retraining	X	X	X	X	
	- All youth & young adults employment training	X				
	- Many educational efforts besides JTPA funds		X			X
	- Develop model & joint programs for disadvantaged					X
7)	Contracting for Services		X	X	X	
	- Regular SDA contracting with Voc Ed					
	- School provision of training 'slots' to SDA/PIC			X	X	
	- School right of 'first refusal' on employment training		X			
	- Schools as "Center of Operations" for PIC			X		
	- Schools collect administration fees for service delivery			X		
8)	Focus					
	- Serve students and young adults	X				
	- Train/retrain adults & dropouts				X	
	- Develop model programs for target populations					X
	- Client-centered	X	X	X	X	X

Dimensions of Coordination Envisaged

Virtually all respondents agreed that Voc Ed/JTPA coordination must be grounded in improved communications--information sharing and ongoing dialogue. There seems a clear consensus that establishing channels for regular dialogue between Voc Ed institutions and the local PIC/SDA is a necessary precondition for coordination. While most references to communication were general, some respondents within each sector listed specific purposes for communication.

A significant number of respondents from all elements in the Voc Ed sector emphasized joint advance planning and a cooperative approach to decision making, along with exchange of members. No SDA responses explicitly included joint planning or increased exchange of members as elements in their definition of coordination. But several SDAs, along with several CCs, discussed nonduplication and complementarity--both of which imply some degree of planning--as important elements in a coordinated approach to meeting client and agency needs.

Although a number of respondents from SDAs and all Voc Ed sectors stated that coordination must include programming and operation, there was a range of visions with potentially conflicting focus and scope. There was no consensus on coordinated programming and operation within any sector. The broadest scope for program coordination, a 'totally cooperative effort of mutual support to attain agreed-upon goals" was described by several CCs and CTY/IND schools. Other respondents from the Voc Ed sector envisaged coordination as an effort broadly concerned with all training and retraining, with Voc Ed institutions acting as full partners in the employment training system.

Several SDAs concurred that Voc Ed should have input into planning--but only for employment training programs concerning youth and young adults. A CC and a COMPHS suggested that cooperative programming should include not only JTPA funded programs, but also many other educational efforts. Several COMPHSs stated that coordination should focus on developing model programs for target populations. The essential conflict was the focus of coordinated efforts. Most SDAs surveyed believe that coordination should focus on serving students and young adults, while many CCs and vocational schools clearly seek involvement in planning and delivering training/retraining programs serving out-of-school (adult and dropout) as well as in-school populations. However, a common 'client-centered' focus for coordination efforts was expressed across both SDA and Voc Ed sectors. There was general agreement on the need to improve the ability of all agencies to meet needs on a client basis.

There was also a wide range of opinion on the scope and form of contracted services which constitute 'ideal' coordination. First, no SDA or COMPHS included contracting as essential to their concept of coordination. Some CCs, RVTSs and CTY/INDs described a "right of first refusal" for Voc Ed institutions or envisaged the vocational system serving as the center of PIC training operations. Others described coordination as including "regular contracting" with Voc Ed institutions to offer JTPA training in daytime and/or after-hours programs, but short of first refusal rights. Still others described coordination as Voc Ed providing training 'slots' to SDA/PICs, and some Voc Ed respondents qualified this even further--"as available."

Respondents were next asked to evaluate the extent to which their agency's or institution's current relationship with the other sector reflects this self-defined ideal, rating it on a scale of one to five (with one meaning not at all and five meaning very well).

Responses were mostly on the negative end of the scale, from 2.0 to 3.0--which could be interpreted as little to somewhat congruence between current and 'ideal' coordination. SDAs surveyed judged current relationships the most satisfactory. However, the ratings were just at the median point of the scale. Among Voc Ed institutions, CCs are least dissatisfied with existing relationships, and RVTSs are most dissatisfied.

TABLE 3: EXTENT CURRENT RELATIONSHIPS REFLECT IDEAL
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Very Well)

Sector	$\bar{X}$	N
SDA	3.0	8
CC	2.8	8
COMPHS	2.6	15
CTY/IND	2.4	10
RVTS	2.0	10
VOC/SEC	2.3	35
ALL/VOC	2.4	43

Participants were also asked to rate the effectiveness of the existing level of coordination between their local SDA/PIC and secondary and postsecondary Voc Ed institutions for meeting the training and related needs of local JTPA-eligible individuals. Employment training agencies judged the situation to fall somewhat on the positive end of the scale. All institutions rated their current local situations

only slightly effective--much closer to ineffective. RVTSs, again judged coordination to be least effective, but CCs and CTY/INDs were only slightly less dissatisfied.

TABLE 4: EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT LOCAL COORDINATION
5 (Very effective) - 1 (Ineffective)

Sector/Rating	5	4	3	2	1	$\bar{X}$
SDA	25%	12%	25%	38%	0%	3.3
COMPHS	22%	0%	22%	11%	44%	2.4
CTY/IND	10%	0%	30%	20%	40%	2.2
CC	0%	12%	38%	0%	50%	2.1
RVTS	7%	0%	14%	29%	50%	1.9
VOC/SEC	12%	0%	21%	21%	45%	2.1
ALL/VOC	10%	2%	24%	17%	46%	2.1

Respondents were asked further to note any recent coordination efforts or changes in the Voc Ed/JTPA relationship in which their agency or institution has participated. Three fourths of employment training/SDA agencies reported recent changes or coordination efforts. A majority of Voc Ed institutions reported recent changes or efforts, with COMPHSs rating this highest and CTY/INDs rating it lowest:

TABLE 5: RECENT COORDINATION EFFORTS OR CHANGES

Sector	% Changed
SDA	75%
COMPHS	60%
RVTS	56%
CC	56%
CTY/IND	30%

Recent Changes

Participants were asked about "recent changes in the relationship or recent coordination efforts in which (they) have participated" in order to determine whether local program operators have been affected by recent federal and state policy emphases on facilitating coordination. Effects were clearly felt in many localities, and some of these could be traced to state and federal coordination mandates.

In particular, some Voc Ed institutions attributed increased coordination to the new federal requirement for academic remediation in JTPA Summer Youth programs. SDAs were more likely to cite state initiatives like Commonwealth Futures and Adult Literacy as forces promoting local coordination. In general, SDAs more often linked recent changes to state policy, while Voc Ed institutions, including CCs, tended to focus more on PIC membership and increased contracting for services. Recent changes reported by each sector are listed in Appendix B.

Encouraging and Discouraging Factors

As a final element in evaluating each sector's perceptions of current JTPA/Voc Ed coordination, respondents were asked to rate the importance of a series of factors in encouraging or discouraging coordination in their communities.

To identify encouraging elements, this study used 13 factors delineated by the National Center's coordination study. Respondents were asked to rate these on a scale of one to five, with one meaning not at all encouraging and five meaning very encouraging. Space was provided for specifying additional encouraging factors.

Discouraging factors included the 13 identified in the national study, along with seven added by local program operators who previewed questionnaires for this study. Space for listing additional discouraging factors was also provided, and the same one to five rating scale employed.

In Tables Six and Seven, the five factors judged most encouraging/discouraging are listed for each sector. Overlap in mean ratings made it impossible to determine strict first, second and third most important factors across sectors (e.g. 4 RVTS encouraging factors were all rated 3.0, and 4 discouraging factors were all rated 3.1). The most encouraging and discouraging factors for each sector are listed to offer a basis for initial comparison and discussion. Commentary following each chart more comprehensively analyzes this key element of perception.

Encouraging Factors

In the analysis that follows, two threads of the survey results will be interwoven: comparison of priority rankings for factors across sectors and relative weightings of how encouraging different respondents rated each factor. On a scale of one (not at all) to five (very), employment training administrators' mean rating for encouraging factors was 3.5--more than moderately encouraging, while vocational educators rated them slightly lower--about 3.0. Among vocational educators, encouraging factors averaged: 3.3 for COMPHSs, 3.1 for CCs, 3.0 for RVTSs, and 2.6 for CTY/INDs. Furthermore, those factors ranked as most encouraging range only around the 'moderate' level. Table Six lists the most encouraging factors.

TABLE 6: MOST ENCOURAGING FACTORS
1 (Not at All) - 5 (Very)

Sector	Factor	$\bar{X}$
SDA		
	Personal relationships among administrators	4.0
	More comprehensive services	3.5
	Strong Governor support for coordination	3.5
	Coordination funding incentives	3.4
	Strong YCC support for coordination	3.3
CC		
	Strong Governor support for coordination	3.7
	Personal relationships among administrators	3.1
	Strong State Council support for coordination	3.0
	More comprehensive services	3.0
	Strong YCC support for coordination	2.9
RVTS		
	More comprehensive services	3.2
	Strong Governor support for coordination	3.0
	Strong State Council support for coordination	3.0
	History of successful coordination	3.0
	Service duplication avoidance	3.0
CTY/IND		
	Personal relationships among administrators	3.2
	History of successful coordination	2.7
	More comprehensive services	2.5
	Effective JTPA service delivery	2.5
	Service duplication avoidance	2.4
COMPHS		
	More comprehensive services	3.6
	Personal relationships among administrators	3.3
	Strong State Council support for coordination	3.3
	Desire to share noneconomic resources	3.2
	Strong YCC support for coordination	3.1

Personal relationships were perceived as the first or second most important encouraging factor by SDA (4.0), CC, CTY/IND and COMPHS respondents (3.1-3.3). RVTSs rated it only sixth (2.8). Client/student needs were also almost universally cited as a top factor--of first importance for RVTSs and COMPHSs (3.2 & 3.0). State level leadership was perceived as another encouraging factor for most institutions surveyed. SDAs, CCs, and RVTSs listed 'strong push from the Governor" as first or second in importance (3.0-3.7); COMPHSs listed it sixth (3.0), CTY/INDs tenth (2.0).

SDAs, CCs and COMPHSs all listed "strong push by Youth Coordinating Council" among the five most important factors (3.3, 2.9, 3.1). By way of contrast, this factor was seen as the first or second least important by RVTSs (2.3) and CTY/INDs (2.0). CCs, RVTSs, and COMPHSs all listed "strong push from State Voc Ed Council" as second or third most important (3.0, 3.0, 3.3). This factor was near the bottom of the list for SDAs (2.6) and last for CTY/INDs (1.9).

Different emphases emerged across sectors regarding how resources are perceived to influence coordination. SDAs cited "presence for funding incentives to promote coordination" as among the most encouraging factors (3.4), while CCs ranked these in the middle (2.8) and RVTSs, CTY/INDs, and COMPHSs put funding incentives at or near the bottom of their lists (2.5, 2.0, 2.6). Conversely, RVTSs and CTY/INDs highly rated "avoiding duplication and overlap in service delivery" (3.0 & 2.4). COMPHSs included "desire to share noneconomic resources" in the top five (2.9), while SDAs ranked resource sharing and nonduplication in the lower half of their listing (2.6). CCs ranked these in the middle (2.8).

On this basis, the different sectors might be characterized as responding to different kinds of encouragement: SDAs seem to respond strongly, and CCs somewhat, to active coordination incentives, particularly funding. RVTS, CTY/IND and COMPHS systems appear to coordinate in a more preventative fashion, responding to perceived gaps or ineffeiencies. "Scarcity of resources" was not seen by any sector as encouraging coordination; it was in the bottom quarter for all sectors and last for SDAs (2.0-2.8). The message seems to be that funding cuts will not, in themselves, drive Voc Ed and JTPA systems to coordinate.

"Prior history of successful coordination" with the other system was highly ranked by only RVTSs and CTY/INDs (2.7 & 3.0). Other sectors put this near the middle of the list (but with similar weightings of (2.8-3.1). Federal coordination mandates in the Perkins Voc Ed Act and JTPA were ranked at middle-to-low importance; for CCs they were at the very bottom (2.3 & 2.4). The SDA was the only sector that ranked requirements in their own law (JTPA) as considerably more influential than mandates in the other law (3.0 to 2.3). Even so, this result was in the mid-range of factor ratings. Voc Ed institutions made little distinction between mandates in Perkins and JTPA. This finding suggests either that federal coordination mandates have been poorly communicated to the local level, or that effective coordination must be approached less as a matter of compliance than it has up to now.

Finally, the perceived effectiveness of the other system in delivering employment training services was listed in the bottom quarter (weighted 2.4-2.9), not considered to be encouraging coordination by most SDA or Voc Ed respondents. CTY/INDs were the exception, ranking it third at (3.0). This result could be interpreted in two ways: either most respondents had little confidence in the effectiveness of the other sector or they did not see judgements of comparative effectiveness as a motivating factor behind coordination efforts.

To summarize, this analysis of factors judged by each sector to be most encouraging, and how encouraging these are perceived to be, challenges assumptions abut what motivates local agencies to coordinate. It must be acknowledged that institutions are responding to pre-selected factors (only 2 respondents used the write-in slot). But, points of agreement emerge on personal relationships between administrators, client needs, and state leadership as important encouraging factors. Points of divergence were also identified.

Findings point up the limited extent to which any individual factor was considered important for encouraging coordination, and the fact that SDAs, on average, found listed factors to have been generally more encouraging than did CTY/IND schools, with CCs and RVTSs falling in the middle.

Discouraging Factors

Rank listings of factors judged by each sector to be most discouraging offer a basis for comparison and a starting point for discussion on removing barriers to coordination. Discouraging factors were perceived as slightly more weighty than encouraging factors--all above 3.2: 3.5 for SDAs, 3.7 for CCs, 3.4 for CTY/INDs, and 3.2 for RVTSs and COMPHSs. There was less agreement across sectors on discouraging than on encouraging factors. Table Seven displays the most discouraging factors.

TABLE 7: MOST DISCOURAGING FACTORS
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Very)

Sector	Factor	$\bar{X}$
SDA		
	Different definitions of allowable services	3.5
	"Turf Issues"	3.4
	Staff & time demands of the RFP process	3.3
	JTPA performance-based contracts and standards	3.1
	Inadequate understanding of JTPA	3.1
CC		
	"Turf Issues"	4.1
	Lack of coordination within JTPA	3.8
	Difficulty of communication between Voc Ed & JTPA	3.8
	Planning or funding cycle problems	3.7
	Different definitions of allowable services	3.3
RVTS		
	Different definitions of allowable services	3.3
	Staff & time demands of the RFP process	3.2
	Difficulty of communication between Voc Ed & JTPA	3.1
	"Turf Issues"	3.1
	Differences in local service area boundaries	3.1
	Local JTPA desire to provide services directly	3.1
CTY/IND		
	"Turf Issues"	3.7
	JTPA performance-based contracts & standards	3.4
	Lack of coordination within JTPA	3.3
	Matching fund requirements for shared programs	3.3
	Staff & time demands of the RFP process	3.3
COMPHS		
	Different definitions of allowable services	3.4
	Inadequate understanding of JTPA	3.2
	"Turf Issues"	3.1
	History of unsuccessful coordination	3.0
	Staff & time demands of the RFP process	3.0

With 20 factors listed and an additional write-in option, consensus emerged on two factors. "Turf issues related to perceived responsibility and roles" was listed across all sectors as the first or second factor most discouraging coordination between Voc Ed or JTPA institutions and the other sector (3.1-4.1). "Differences in respective definitions of allowable services and/or budgetary items" was perceived as most important by SDAs, RVTSs and COMPHSs (3.3-3.5), among the top five factors by CCs (3.3) and in the top third by CTY/INDs (2.9).

There was fairly broad agreement on two other factors. All sectors but CCs listed "staff & time demands on the RFP process" among the top five most discouraging factors (3.0-3.3). CCs listed it eighth (3.1). CCs and RVTSs listed "Difficulty of communication between Voc Ed & JTPA/too many channels to go through" (3.1-3.8) as the second and third most discouraging factors, respectively. SDAs and CTY/INDs listed it sixth--still in the top third (3.0). "Lack of coordination within the JTPA sector was rated as a very discouraging factor (in the top third) by all Voc Ed systems (2.9-3.8), while "lack of coordination within Voc Ed" was rated considerably less important, thirteenth, by SDA administrators (2.4).

Conversely, SDAs ranked "inadequate understanding of Voc Ed legislation, roles, procedures" as the fourth most discouraging factor (3.1), while most Voc Ed respondents saw "inadequate understanding of JTPA" as of mid-to-low importance (2.5-2.9; only COMPHSs ranked it second (3.2). "JTPA performance standards and performance-based contracting" were also perceived by SDAs to be important barriers to coordination (3.1). Yet, of the Voc Ed systems, only the CTY/INDs rated performance standards of primary importance (2.4-3.0). Similarly, only RVTSs perceived some SDAs' desire to provide services directly as a major obstacle to coordination (third importance, 3.1); CCs rated it ninth (3.1). CTY/IND schools, COMPHSs and JTPA sectors put it near the bottom of the list (2.3-2.4). RVTS was also the only sector to perceive "differences in local service area boundaries" as a major obstacle (3.1). Other sectors, including CCs, listed this factor among the least important (2.0-2.4).

Regulatory issues like "matching fund requirements" (2.9-3.3), "differences in eligibility requirements" (2.4-3.2) and "planning or funding cycle problems" (2.5-3.7) were rated as somewhat discouraging for SDA and Voc Ed sectors almost across the board. Among the Voc Ed systems, CTY/INDs found matching funds most, and eligibility requirements least, discouraging, while RVTSs ranked matching funds as less discouraging than the others. "No history of coordination" (2.7-2.8) was also seen as a factor somewhat discouraging to coordination.

"Paperwork requirements for eligibility" (2.4-2.8) and "personal or philosophical conflicts between administrators" were seen as only slightly discouraging (2.3-2.8). SDAs perceived "lack of availability" and "inaccessible location" of Voc Ed facilities as falling in the middle range--somewhat discouraging (2.9 & 2.8). Voc Ed systems rated these factors as among the least discouraging (1.9-2.3). Factors which SDA and Voc Ed respondents agreed were among the least discouraging included: the other sector's "ineffectiveness in delivering employment training" or "inadequate capacity to address client literacy and basic skill needs." "Inability to coordinate support services" was also not judged to be a factor discouraging coordination.

To summarize, the wide agreement on "turf issues" indicates that one of the greatest barriers to coordination is psychological and perceptual--and could be in large part overcome through dialogue. The emphasis on "difficulty of communication/too many channels to go through" as a major discouraging factor confirms the earlier conclusion that <u>establishing effective local communication channels is an essential prerequisite for coordination</u>. The JTPA sector's "inadequate understanding of Voc Ed" would also be improved by ongoing communication.

Other less subjective barriers were identified. Two of the major obstacles to coordination--"differences in respective definitions of allowable services and/or budgetary items" and "staff and time demands"-- could possibly both be partially alleviated by state level interventions. Regulatory issues like matching, eligibility, performance standards and performance-based contracting remain, but it is promising that such relatively intractable factors were judged to be only somewhat discouraging. Geographical boundaries also appear to be a concern for only one sector. Other factors rated slightly discouraging--paperwork, inaccessibility or lack of availability of vocational facilities--could most effectively be solved at the local level.

SECTION B: SERVICE DELIVERY AND PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Because there is no indicator in the JTPA management information system to denote a primary service provider, it is very difficult to measure the extent to which Voc Ed institutions are currently delivering JTPA funded services. This study collected information from both systems on numbers of programs and enrollments for which JTPA contracted with Voc Ed institutions in the Program Year 1986 (PY '86). Information was collected from the SDAs according to JTPA funding source: Title IIA (Main allocation) and Title IIB (Summer Youth) funds, as well as for Title III (Displaced Worker) and Eight Percent Education Coordination JTPA funds.

Given that the response rate was just over 50 percent, this data provides an incomplete picture. It does, however, offer a sense of the scope and range of JTPA contracting and service delivery through Voc Ed institutions. There was an effort to measure JTPA's funding running through Voc Ed institutions as a proportion of each SDA's total JTPA funding, although this data is less complete than the rest and far from conclusive. Data on numbers of JTPA funded programs Voc Ed institutions delivered was not analyzed, as no common definition of "program" could be determined.

Service Delivery Area Reports

Table Eight presents SDA reports of the numbers of Title IIA clients served in Voc Ed institutions in PY 1986.

TABLE 8: TITLE IIA CLIENTS SERVED BY VOC INSTITUTIONS

# Clients	Voc-Tech Schools	Other Public Secondary	Community Colleges
1000+	0	0	0
500-1000	1	1	0
250-499	0	0	0
51-250	0	2	1
11-50	0	2	1
1-10	4	0	2
-0-	2	2	3

In this sample of eight SDAs in PY 1986, SDAs most often reported contracting with Voc-Tech Schools (4) to serve an annual total of fewer than 10 Title IIA clients, and two SDAs did not contract with any Voc-Tech Schools. SDAs reported contracting with Non-Vocational Public Secondary Schools for larger total numbers of clients (2 for 11-50, 2 for 51-250), although again two SDAs did not contract with any of these schools. There was one case each of an SDA contracting with a Voc-Tech School and a COMPHS for services to more than 500 clients in PY 1986. Where Title IIA funds were concerned, SDAs reported contracting with CCs for an annual total of between one and 250 clients, with three SDAs not contracting with any CCs to deliver Title IIA services. Title IIA allocations represent the majority of JTPA funds, and these funds go directly to SDAs. Table Nine, below, indicates SDA reports of Title IIB clients in Voc Ed institutions for summer youth programs.

TABLE 9: TITLE IIB CLIENTS SERVED BY VOC INSTITUTIONS

# Clients	Voc-Tech Schools	Other Public Secondary	Community Colleges
1000+	1	0	0
500-1000	0	0	0
250-499	0	1	0
51-250	1	2	1
11-50	0	3	1
1-10	1	0	0
-0-	5	2	6

In this sample, SDAs which funded Voc Ed institutions to serve Title IIB Summer Youth clients also tended to contract for services to fewer than 250 clients. There were two exceptions to this general rule: one SDA funded service delivery to more than 1,000 youth through Voc-Tech Schools and a second SDA delivered services to between 250 and 400 youth through Other Public Secondary Schools. Overall, the majority of SDA respondents contracted with Other Public Secondary Schools, but, not with Voc-Tech Schools or CCs to deliver Summer Youth services in PY 1986. It is likely that these figures will look quite different for PY 1987 since Congress has mandated that all Title IIB programs contain an academic or remedial component.

With complete client data reported by only five SDAs, attempts to estimate the proportion of JTPA funded clients served in secondary and postsecondary Voc Ed institutions were hardly conclusive.

TABLE 10: CLIENTS SERVED IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Title IIA		Title IIB	
% Clients	# SDAs	% Clients	# SDAs
60%	2	100%	2
54%	1	75%	1
34%	1	28%	1
5%	1	20%	1
2%	1		

Vocational Education Reports

Voc Ed administrators were also asked to report data on services delivered to JTPA clients by program and by funding title. Voc Ed reports on numbers of JTPA clients served by each system (CC, RVTS, CTY/IND, COMPHS) in PY 1986 appear in Table 11. In Appendix C, these totals are broken out by Title IIA (Main), Title IIB (Summer Youth), and Eight Percent Education Coordination funding sources.

TABLE 11: CLIENTS SERVED WITH JTPA FUNDS

# Clients	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
1000+	0	0	0	0
500-1000	0	0	0	0
250-499	1	1	0	1
51-250	0	0	2	4
11-50	2	1	2	1
1-10	1	1	0	0
-0-	8	5	5	2
	(N = 12)	(N = 8)	(N = 9)	(N = 8)

Besides enrollments, Voc Ed administrators were also asked to report the amounts of JTPA funding their institutions were awarded to deliver services in PY 1986. Table 12, below, reports total JTPA funds administered by each category of Voc Ed institution. Totals are broken out by funding type/title in Appendix D.

TABLE 12: INSTITUTIONS REPORTING PY '86 JTPA FUNDS

Funds ($)	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
250,001-500,000	1	1	0	1
100,001-250,000	0	0	2	1
50,001-100,000	1	0	0	3
10,001-50,000	1	3	1	1
5,001-10,000	0	0	1	0
1-5,000	0	0	0	0
-0-	8	5	4	2
	(N = 11)	(N = 9)	(N = 8)	(N = 8)

Discrepancies in reported SDA and Voc Ed enrollments--apparent in Tables 8, 9 & 11--are largely due to the lack of geographic congruency between SDAs and Voc Ed institutions which responded to the survey. Voc Ed responses indicated that in PY 1986 COMPHSs and CCs served many more JTPA Title IIB Summer Youth and Eight Percent Grant funded clients than Title IIA clients; RVTSs served a few more IIA and Eight Percent than Summer Youth. Still, the majority of RVTS, COMPHS and CC respondents reported zero enrollments in any JTPA category.

No CTY/IND schools reported serving Summer Youth or Eight Percent Education Coordination clients, but three served clients funded from Title IIA, the main JTPA allocation--and one of these administered over $250,000 in Title IIA funded programs. CCs reported the widest range of JTPA sources, including Title III (Displaced Worker) funds. One college reported an additional source--Department of Public Welfare employment training funds administered through the JTPA SDA. It is harder to draw any conclusions about the overall patterns of JTPA funding totals across categories of Voc Ed institutions (see Appendix D).

Types of Services Provided

Employment training administrators were asked to indicate which kinds of activities and services public education institutions provided to their clients in PY 1986. They reported instructional and administrative support; these are listed in Table 13.

TABLE 13: SDA REPORT OF SERVICES VOC ED MOST OFTEN PROVIDED JTPA

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Personnel/Staff
Counseling
Space
Classroom occupational skills training
GED preparation

VOC-TECH SCHOOLS

Counseling
Personnel/Staff
Space
Classroom skills training

OTHER PUBLIC SECONDARY

Space
Equipment
Counseling
General Administration
Personnel/Staff
Classroom occupational skills training
Basic academic skills training
GED preparation

Voc Ed administrators were also asked to indicate which types of activities or services their institutions provided to the SDA/PIC in PY 1986 and Summer 1986. They reported providing a considerably wider range of services than the SDAs reported receiving from them. Only the most frequently reported are listed here in Table 14. For a detailed breakout of services by kind of institution see Appendix E.

TABLE 14: VOC ED REPORT OF SERVICES MOST OFTEN PROVIDED TO JTPA

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

General administration
Referrals
Space
Equipment
Personnel/Staff
Intake/Vocational assessment
Classroom occupational skills training
Basis academic skills training
GED preparation
Bilingual educational training

VOC-TECH SCHOOLS

General administration
Space
Personnel/Staff
Job Development
Equipment
Referrals
Tracking/Follow-up
Counseling
Classroom occupational skill training
Vocational exploration
Employability/Job readiness training

OTHER PUBLIC SECONDARY

Personnel/Staff
Credit
Referrals
Intake/Vocational assessment
Classroom occupational skills training
Vocational exploration
Basic academic skills training
Employability/Job readiness training

Contract Modes

SDA and Voc Ed administrators were also asked to identify the contracting modes they use to coordinate with the other sector, and which of these they find MOST and LEAST satisfactory. Table 15 charts percentages of respondents who reported using each of six types of contracting in PY 1986.

TABLE 15: INSTITUTIONS IN EACH CONTRACT MODE

Contract type	SDA	CC	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS
RFP	63%	88%	40%	22%	50%
Purchase/Sell Program slots	63%	38%	40%	44%	13%
Class-size training	50%	38%	10%	0%	13%
Customized training for employers	0%	25%	10%	0%	13%
Joint RFP development	25%	38%	30%	0%	13%
Programs for School students during or after hours	38%	12%	30%	11%	38%
	(N=8)	(N=8)	(N=10)	(N=9)	(N=8)

(Percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple responses)

SDAs identified precisely the modes they most frequently utilize--RFPs, Purchasing 'Slots' and, somewhat less, contracting for class-sized and in-school training--as their preferred modes of contracting. Only one SDA indicated a least satisfactory mode: joint RFP development. Voc Ed contracting preferences and dislikes were less clear, and too few institutions commented to create discernable patterns across different types of institutions. But, it is clear that current contracting practices reflect Voc Ed preferences much less than they reflect SDA preferences. The most common Voc Ed preferences were for selling slots and conducting class-size training. Two Voc Ed

institutions found RFP response the most satisfactory mode, but three others identified this as least satisfactory. One institution found joint RFP development most satisfactory and one found it least. Customized training was judged the least satisfactory mode by two Voc Ed institutions.

JTPA Performance Standards and Client Needs

Voc Ed institutions rated their success in meeting JTPA performance standards considerable higher than SDAs rated it. SDAs, on the average, rated Voc Ed more than moderately successful in meeting performance standards (3.2 on a scale of one to five) while most Voc Ed institutions rated their performance as quite successful--above four.

TABLE 16: VOC ED SUCCESS MEETING JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Very)

Sector	$\bar{X}$	N
SDA	3.2	7
COMPHS	4.7	6
CC	4.6	7
RVTS	4.1	8
CTY/IND	3.7	6

SDAs and Voc Ed institutions were also asked to rate the extent to which programs offered at local Voc Ed institutions meet the need of JTPA clients. Again, all Voc Ed sectors perceived their programs as considerably more responsive or potentially responsive for meeting JTPA client needs than did SDAs. SDAs rated programs offered by Community-Based Organizations as more effective for meeting client needs than any of the Voc Ed sectors, at 4.0.

TABLE 17: VOC ED SUCCESS MEETING JTPA CLIENT NEEDS
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Very)

Institution	SDA $\bar{X}$	VOC ED $\bar{X}$
CC	3.4	4.5
Voc-Tech	3.1	--
- RVTS	--	4.0
- CTY/IND	--	4.5
COMPHS	3.0	3.7
CBO	4.0	--

Overall, SDAs rated Voc Ed institutions' effectiveness in meeting JTPA performance standards and local client needs approximately the same--slightly above average. Among RVTSs, COMPHSs, and CTY/INDs, schools assessed their success in meeting performance standards and their effectiveness in meeting local client needs differently. COMPHSs judged that they meet performance standards better than client needs, while CTY/IND schools determined the opposite.

Voc Ed Effectiveness with Specific Services and JTPA Clients

SERVICE DELIVERY AREA OPINIONS:

SDAs and Voc Ed sectors were also asked to comment on what kinds of services they have found public Voc Ed institutions to deliver MOST or LEAST successfully and which JTPA client populations they MOST or LEAST effectively serve. Slightly more than half of the SDA respondents offered opinions on this topic. Two SDAs listed "training" as what Voc Ed does most effectively, while one listed "education and training" and two specified "education, not training," including pre-vocational, GED preparation and academic remediation. Only one SDA cited a least successful Voc Ed activity, stating that Voc Ed institutions have insufficient funding for support services.

Three SDAs specified youth or in-school youth as the population Voc Ed serves most effectively. Although one SDA stated that Voc Ed effectively serves AFDC recipients, two others disagreed. They expressed the opinion that Voc Ed effectively serves only the most skilled JTPA clients and is poorly structured to meet the needs of traditional JTPA client groups: welfare mothers and the least skilled.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OPINIONS:

Voc Ed institutions listed a much wider variety of services they deliver effectively, and most described a greater diversity of client populations they serve or could serve well. Areas of strength commonly cited by CCs include: academic remediation and GED/adult basic education, long and short-term skill training and counseling. One CC stated that it was best suited to provide short-term training, while another stated long-term. Several colleges listed specific skill areas; a few added job development and placement, support services or workplace literacy. Six of eight CCs stated that they can effectively serve all adult populations, including displaced workers and homemakers, single parents, AFDC recipients, disabled, limited English proficient, youth or criminal offenders. One suburban CC stated that it has difficulty serving any JTPA populations because of transportation problems. Only one CC expressed the opinion that it best serves employed persons seeking to upgrade their skills.

REGIONAL VOC-TECH SCHOOL OPINIONS:

Thirteen of 16 RVTS respondents commented on services they deliver and clients they serve effectively. Five RVTSs stated that they can effectively deliver all needed services, including short or long-term skills and employability training, education, support and counseling.

Five others emphasized their capacity to deliver skills training components, either short or long-term. Two others focused on short-term training/retraining for adults, but included counseling, support, placement and follow-up services. One RVTS emphasized its capacity to deliver educational services, including literacy and ESL. The two RVTSs which commented on services they are least capable of delivering cited on-the-job/follow-up support and childcare.

Most RVTS respondents expressed the opinion that they can serve, or have served, every target group within the JTPA client population, including youth and adults, dropouts and the unemployed. Only two respondents identified populations they believe their institutions serve least well: for one RVTS it is those over age 21, and for the other, it is those with low basic skills.

CITY AND INDEPENDENT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS OPINIONS:

Eight of 10 CTY/IND respondents emphasized their capacity to offer short and long-term skill training programs--supported by vocational assessment, counseling, and job search--in a range of skill areas. One characterized this as a "very comprehensive package of services." Another institution currently offers only one-year skill training programs, but is seeking ways to integrate mid-year skill training programs.

Regarding populations, more than half of CTY/IND respondents stated that they cannot effectively serve individuals who are illiterate or with academic skills below the fourth grade level, or whose command of English is limited. Similarly, one institution stated that JTPA clients must be able to meet each department's minimal academic standards. Two City Vocational Schools expressed the opinion that they can serve any JTPA population. Conversely, one did not believe they should be serving JTPA clients, but should focus on high school students.

COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL OPINIONS:

COMPHS responses were more divided on perceptions of services delivered effectively. Half the respondents emphasized their capacity to deliver short or long-term skill training, including counseling and academic supports. Several respondents focused on specific skill areas or formats: vocational exploration or summer youth programs. The other half emphasized their capacity to meet academic support and remediation, career awareness, guidance. There was no agreement on populations COMPHs most effectively serve. Two respondents focused on students and out-of school youth motivated to pursue GEDs, while two others believed their institutions are most effective with underemployed and disadvantaged working adults. Finally, two schools stated that they effectively serve a wide range of displaced and disadvantaged youth and adult populations.

Needed Changes: SDA and Voc Ed Perspectives

All respondents were asked to comment on changes they believed Voc Ed institutions need to make to better serve JTPA clients. SDA suggestions centered on four themes:

1) need for Voc Ed to view itself in a broader sense as serving the whole community, not just youth, and to recruit and serve more clients in need of rememdiation;

2) need to expand the hours programs are available and to develop open-entry/open-exit and short term programing on a year-round basis;

3) need to develop more job and apprenticeship placement capacity and to gear training more to employment;

4) need to coordinate more with the JTPA system at the planning stages.

Relatively few of the Voc Ed respondents specified changes they would like their institutions to undertake to develop their capacity to serve JTPA clients. The majority feel that they have developed considerable, and often unused, capacity to serve JTPA clients and that their staff is prepared to do so. Or, they believe they are already doing a good job--as one RVTS put it, "we are constantly changing our approach to better adapt to all client population needs."

Of the changes that were suggested, many focused on the need for more resources to work with JTPA: staff time, space to run JTPA training during prime hours; more and continuous funding, preferably on a 2-3 year basis rather than RFP response. Other comments emphasized increased communication between JTPA planning and decision making. Voc Ed respondents also saw increasing utilization of schools and colleges to provide training services as key. One COMPHS respondent stated that performance-based contracts and standards must be clarified to facilitate Voc Ed participation.

However, two CCs, one RVTS and three CTY/IND schools identified changes they believe their institutions could make to increase their effectiveness in serving JTPA clients. One CC stated that it needed to improve coordination with the local RVTS to be able to provide additional training services. Another cited a need to make more pre-vocational and remedial basic education services available (corresponding to the first SDA theme). A RVTS stated that it needs to expand a recently developed capacity to deliver literacy training and to make this a model for other services. A City Vocational School emphasized that it must continue to cultivate private industry's willingness to work with eligible JTPA populations. Another stated that it needs to develop programs that can operate during the school year. Similarly, a third hopes to admit adults into daytime training programs.

Comparative View: Voc Ed Mission and JTPA Service Delivery

Clearly, each Voc Ed administrator's perception of whether his or her institution needs to change to serve JTPA clients, and of what changes may be needed, reflects the institution's previous commitment to serving these populations. It must also be emphasized that the summary above does not take into account the specifics of local JTPA/Voc Ed coordination relationships. Even so, an underlying conflict seems clear. SDA suggestions for Voc Ed changes rest on a redefined Voc Ed mission to serve as a year-round community resource, with more emphasis on job training and placement. However, few SDAs seem to acknowledge the constraints Voc Ed faces in fulfilling this mission, even where they agree. Voc Ed comments here and in Section A indicate that many schools and CCs are already working, or are willing to work, to incorporate this mission; others are not. Regardless of the extent of their willingness to serve JTPA clients, vocational administrators face constraints on available resources and staff and on institutional flexibility as they struggle to find a new balance in redefining their own institutions' education and training mission.

Eight Percent Grant Impact on Coordination

The JTPA Eight Percent Education Coordination Grant is one regulatory lever built into the Act which seeks to promote Voc Ed/JTPA coordination at the local level. Massachusetts is one of the few states in which the Eight Percent funding is not administered by the state education agency. Rather, Eight Percent administrative money is split between EOEA and DOE, where it funds state and regional level Employment Training and Education specialists. The Youth Coordinating Council (YCC), an interagency group operating under the authority of the

inoperative State Job Training Coordination Council (SJTCC), determined PY '85 and PY '86 Eight Percent funding priorities. It allocated funding based on responses to RFPs which heavily emphasized collaborative planning between schools and SDAs. The YCC developed RFP guidelines and evaluated proposals submitted.

Given that the YCC and OTEP have reported on both Eight Percent procedures and outcomes, this study will not evaluate these. Although the Eight Percent process is an important tool for promoting specific kinds of collaborative activities with a small piece of JTPA funds, it is less central to the question of how effectively Voc Ed/JTPA coordination operates at a systemic level. Furthermore, Eight Percent grants fund activities to schools in general, not specifically Voc Ed schools (unlike CETA's six percent Voc Ed coordination fund). This local survey posed only two questions about the Eight Percent Education Coordination fund to SDAs and Voc Ed institutions in order to measure the extent of involvement and local perceptions of the impact of Eight Percent funds on overall coordination. Table 18 illustrates SDA and school/college participation in Eight Percent funded activities. It lists the percentage of institutions in each category--including SDAs--which applied for, and were awarded, Eight Percent coordination funds.

TABLE 18: EIGHT PERCENT FUNDS IN PY '85 & PY '86

Sector	% Applied	% Awarded	N
SDA	100%	88%	8
CC	86%	71%	7
RVTS	23%	15%	13
CTY/IND	10%	10%	10
COMPHS	20%	10%	10

All the SDA respondents applied for Eight Percent funding in one of two previous years, and all but one of these applicants were awarded funds. Similary, all but one CC respondent has applied for Eight Percent funds, and all but one of the CC applicants was awarded funds. SDA respondents reported collaborating mostly with public school districts, area high schools and CCs. Only one reported working with a RVTS (as one among 10 high schools). These Eight Percent efforts focused on dropout prevention and serving at-risk-youth, offering literacy, basic education and GED preparation services to out-of-school youth.

It should be noted that Eight Percent proposals required collaboration between SDAs and at least one eduational institution. In JTPA's first year, they also required SDA applicants to establish Education Committees under local PIC Boards, and many proposals were generated in these committees. As will be discussed in Section D, many of these original Eight Percent committees have been institutionalized and some have taken on broader planning and advising functions.

Voc Ed high schools participated in applying for Eight Percent funding much less often than CCs. Only three of thirteen RVTS and one of 10 CTY/IND respondents had applied. Two of the three RVTS applicants were awarded funding, as was the one CTY/IND applicant.

Two of 10 COMPHSs participated in Eight Percent applications, and one of these was funded (although it is not clear that Chapter 74 programs were involved in this case).

It is hardly surprising that SDAs and CCs rated the Eight Percent coordination funding most positively as a force for promoting overall systemic coordination. RVTSs and CTY/IND schools rated it fairly negatively, while the COMPHSs surveyed rated it as neutral.

TABLE 19: EIGHT PERCENT FUND IMPACT ON LOCAL COORDINATION QUALITY
1 (Negative) - 5 (Positive)

Sector	$\bar{X}$
SDA	4.2
CC	4.0
COMPHS	3.0
RVTS	2.3
CTY/IND	2.3

Respondents from all sectors were given the opportunity to suggest improvements in Eight Percent planning or distribution procedures. SDA suggestions focused on three areas. First, paperwork and documentation was described as burdensome for schools; streamlining it was a stated priority (the Commonwealth Futures effort to develop a single planning document and funding application was cited). Second, several SDAs felt the Eight Percent RFP process was too ambiguous for a collaborative working group to respond to; criteria should be clearer. A third stream of comments advocated more fundamental change in the process, with part of the Eight Percent funding distributed by allocation to all SDAs with the purpose of promoting the development of joint JTPA/Voc Ed Programs.

Voc Ed suggestions began with the need to make the opportunity to apply for Eight Percent funding more generally known. Several institutions stated that they had not heard about it. This ignorance was perceived as the result of gaps between state and local communication, as well as JTPA/Voc Ed communication at the local level. Several respondents commented that in their experience the process was "too political" or skewed geographically or in favor of comprehensive school districts. They suggested mandating coordination with Voc Ed in the RFPs or giving control of the Eight Percent funding allocation to DOE.

A RVTS that had administered Eight Percent funding offered three very specific suggestions:

1. More direct involvement of schools and colleges in the application process;

2. Clarification of the importance of using Eight Percent funding to promote general coordination, as well as delivering direct services to targeted populations (dropouts, illiterates);

3. More standardization of eligibility and management information with other systems and funded options.

A COMPHS with Eight Percent funded programs stated that "administrative and contractual arrangements were working well--no major recommendations for improvements."

SECTION C: PLANNING INPUT AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE

This section examines how SDAs and Voc Ed institutions utilized channels available to them for exchanging information and coordinating planning locally. Some of the local level practices surveyed were, in fact, mandated in JTPA and the Perkins Act specifically to promote coordination. Findings on the following seven types of coordination practices are presented and discussed in turn.

- SDA Review of local Voc Ed institutions' application for Perkins funds and the extent to which this is perceived as promoting effective coordination.
- School and College opportunities to review annual local JTPA plans and the extent of their participation in the SDA/PIC planning process.
- School, College and or DOE provision to PICs of listings for all Perkins funded programs at the local level.
- Inclusion of schools and colleges on PIC mailing lists for notification about meetings, RFPs, etc.
- Assignment of staff people charged with JTPA/Voc Ed coordination responsibilities.
- Institutional criteria articulating coordination goals.
- Availability and utilization of technical assistance for coordination from DOE and OTEP.

SDA/PIC Review of Applications for Perkins Funds

SDAs were asked to what extent their SDA/PIC reviewed local Voc Ed institutions' applications for federal Voc Ed (Perkins) funds in PY '86. Voc Ed institutions were asked to judge the extent to which the local SDA/PIC reviewed its Perkins applications. All sectors were asked to offer their opinion on the extent to which this mandated review has promoted useful local coordination. Table 20 illustrates the findings.

TABLE 20: PERKINS APPLICATION REVIEW & COORDINATION PROMOTION BY PICs
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Extensively)

Sector	Review $\bar{X}$	Promotion $\bar{X}$	N
SDA	2.1	2.0	8
CC	3.3	2.0	8
CTY/IND	3.2	1.9	9
COMPHS	3.2	2.5	10
RVTS	1.7	1.6	14

Fully 50% of the SDA respondents stated that their PIC did not review Voc Ed institutions' Perkins applications at all. Accordingly, they judged the review not at all useful for promoting coordination. In both cases, the mean rating was negative--around two. Given that Perkins applications cannot be funded without a PIC signature, it seems that the mandated 'review' is most often a 'signing off.' Similarly, all Voc Ed sectors, except RVTSs (1.7), rated the extent of review as slightly better than neutral (3.2-3.3). Yet, they uniformly judged it to be a very weak tool for promoting coordination (1.6-2.5).

School/College Review of Local JTPA Plan

There is no parallel mandate in JTPA specifically requiring Voc Ed review of local SDA/PICs' annual job training plan, although general public review is mandated. This imbalance is mirrored in state level regulations. The SJTCC must comment on the biennial state input into the development of the Governor's JTPA Coordination and Special Services Plan. Even so, because dialogue is fundamental for any kind of coordination, this survey asked the SDA and Voc Ed sectors whether local Voc Ed institutions are provided opportunities for input, or to review or comment on the annual SDA/PIC plan. All sectors were also asked whether local Voc Ed institutions had, in fact, commented regularly on these plans.

One hundred percent of SDAs surveyed reported that Voc Ed institutions were offered opportunities for review or comment on local JTPA plans. Thirty-eight percent of SDAs reported that Voc Ed institutions commented regularly; 50% stated that Voc Ed did not comment regularly, and 12% did not know. Voc Ed responses to the same questions are reported below in Table 21.

TABLE 21: VOC ED PARTICIPATION IN PIC ANNUAL PLAN

	Opportunity to Comment			Comment Regularly			
Sector	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't Know	N
CC	56%	44%	--	44%	56%	--	9
RVTS	40%	57%	7%	27%	67%	7%	15
CTY/IND	30%	70%	--	30%	70%	--	10
COMPHS	20%	80%	--	20%	80%	--	10

An evident gap exists between SDAs' belief that they provide Voc Ed institutions with opportunities to review annual employment training plans and many Voc Ed institutions' perception that they are not afforded such opportunities. Only in the CC sector were a majority of respondents aware of opportunities to comment on the JTPA plans. One possible explanation for this difference lies in the nature of the local review built into the JTPA planning process. In many cases, there is a period during which the plan is available for general public review; a public meeting may be held. This does not, however, specifically target Voc Ed institutions in the same way the Perkins review solicits input from JTPA, and it apparently fails to reach or engage a large number of schools and colleges.

Voc Ed administrators were also asked to rate how actively their institutions participate in the overall process of employment training planning for their area (rated on a scale of one to five, from not at all to extensively). Table 22 charts the results.

TABLE 22: VOC INSTITUTION PARTICIPATION IN JTPA PLANNING
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Extensive)

Sector	$\bar{X}$	N
CC	3.0	8
RVTS	2.4	14
CTY/IND	2.1	10
COMPHS	2.1	10

CCs also rated their institutions' general level of participation in local JTPA planning higher than did the other Voc Ed sectors, although it was still moderate (3.0). It is interesting that respondents from RVTSs, CTY/INDS, and COMPHSs judged their institutions to be somewhat active in SDA/PIC planning (2.1-2.4), even though few of them felt they had opportunities for input into the formal planning document.

Provision to PICs of Perkins and Local Program Listings

The Perkins Voc Ed act mandates that the State Education Agency make available to PICs listings of all Perkins funded programs. Of the eight SDAs surveyed, 88% reported that they had not been provided such a listing in PY 1986, and 12% said that they did not know. Respondents were also asked whether local Voc Ed institutions had provided them with a listing of locally available program offerings. Although not federally mandated, such information would be essential for coordinating local planning. A few SDAs reported that they had received local listings: 25% said yes, 63% said no and 12% said they don't know. Table 23 charts Voc Ed responses to inquiries about whether their institution or DOE had made Perkins and/or local program listings available to the PICs.

TABLE 23: PROVISION OF VOC ED PROGRAM LISTINGS TO PICs

	Provided Perkins Listing			Provided Local Listing			
Sector	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't Know	N
CC	44%	23%	33%	44%	12%	44%	9
RVTS	13%	33%	54%	27%	40%	33%	15
CTY/IND	20%	50%	30%	40%	40%	20%	10
COMPHS	60%	10%	30%	50%	10%	40%	10

Voc Ed Institutions on PIC Mailing Lists

SDAs were asked how regularly they include RVTSs, CTY/INDS, COMPHSs and CCs in their mailings to announce programs, meetings and opportunities to bid on RFPs. Voc Ed respondents were asked how regularly they believe their institutions are included in such PIC/SDA mailings. Each sector's average rating of inclusion is reported in Table 24 on a scale of one to five, with five meaning always and one meaning never.

TABLE 24: REGULARITY OF VOC ED INCLUSION IN PIC MAILINGS
1 (Never) - 5 (Always)

Sector	$\bar{X}$	N
SDA	4.4	8
CC	3.3	9
RVTS	3.1	15
COMPHS	2.5	10
CTY/IND	2.3	10

SDA Respondents reported that they nearly always include local Voc Ed institutions in relevant mailings. CCs and RVTSs believe they were included slightly more than half the time. COMPHSs and CTY/INDs believe they were included less often. As in much of this section, responses in Table 23 reflect perceptions of inclusion more than they illuminate actual practice. The larger intention is to highlight where there is, and is not, congruence between SDA and Voc Ed experiences of practices intended to promote coordination.

Staff Responsible for JTPA/Voc Ed Coordination

All respondents were asked whether their institution had a full-time (FT) or part-time (PT) staff person assigned central responsibility for coordinating with the other sector. Very few institutions reported having a staff person charged with working either full or part-time on coordination. Voc Ed institutions, to varying degrees, are making efforts to coordinate with the SDAs and the SDAs with Voc Ed. However, the majority of institutions have not designated a specific staff member as primarily responsible for the outreach, dialogue, planning and implementation entailed. This survey did not try to determine whether SDAs and Voc Ed institutions which assign staff have higher levels of coordination than those which do not, or which comes first, coordination staff or activities. Table 25 lists the percent of full and part-time staff assigned to coordination.

TABLE 25: STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATION

Sector	FT	PT	None	N
SDA	--	25%	75%	8
CC	33%	22%	45%	9
RVTS	20%	33%	47%	15
CTY/IND	20%	10%	70%	10
COMPHS	--	40%	50%	9

Institutional Criteria Articulating Coordination Goals

As a sixth indicator of institutional practices affecting coordination, SDAs and Voc Ed institutions were asked whether they had developed criteria or implementation plans for coordinating with the other sector. SDAs were specifically asked whether their Local Service Plan for PY '86-87 or their applications for Eight Percent Education Coordination funds contained such criteria. State JTPA agencies or the Governor's Coordination Plan can mandate that Local Plans contain

coordination criteria, and in fact, criteria for coordination were required in Eight Percent applications. Because Perkins applications need not contain coordination criteria, this questions was posed to Voc Ed institutions more generally.

SDAs and Voc Ed institutions which responded affirmatively were asked to assess:

- To what extent have criteria been implemented?
- To what extent has this improved Voc Ed /JTPA coordination?

Relatively few respondents stated that they had formulated institutional criteria for coordination: One of eight SDAs, no CCs, three of 15 RVTSs, one of 10 City Vocational Schools and two of 10 COMPHSs. One of the three RVTSs reported that its coordination criteria have been proposed but not yet adopted; both COMPHSs reported that their criteria were informal and not in writing. Only one of the institutions, the SDA, felt that it had fairly thoroughly implemented its coordination criteria (four on a scale of one to five), but that the effect on coordination had been moderate (3). The Voc Ed institutions with written criteria rated both implementation and effect on coordination as moderate (3). These findings are charted below in Table 26 on a scale of one (thoroughly, greatly) to five (not at all).

TABLE 26: COORDINATION CRITERIA
1 (thoroughly) - 5 (not at all)

Sector	Criteria Exist	Criteria Implemented	Coordination Improved	N
SDA	14%	4	3	8
CC	--	--	--	9
RVTS	20%	3	3	15
CTY/IND	10%	3	3	10
COMPHS	20%	--	--	10

Availability and Utilization of Technical Assistance

The final item surveyed under "Planning Input and Information Exchange" is a less direct indicator of institutional coordination practices. It also reflects state agency emphases in coordination and availability of structures and linkages to offer technical assistance. Respondents were asked "to what extent their SDA or Voc Ed institution has benefited form state of regional technical assistance for coordination from DOE and OTEP." Table 27, below, lists institutions' assessment of how much they have benefited from technical assistance for coordination provided by their own agency and by the other sector, on a scale of one (not at all) to five (greatly).

TABLE 27: BENEFIT FROM COORDINATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Sector	DOE						OTEP						
	5	4	3	2	1	$\bar{X}$	5	4	3	2	1	$\bar{X}$	N
SDA	--	--	12%	25%	63%	1.5	12%	12%	39%	12%	25%	2.4	8
COMPHS	57%	11%	11%	--	11%	3.8	12%	25%	--	38%	25%	2.6	9
RVTS	29%	7%	36%	14%	14%	3.4	--	--	29%	--	71%	1.6	14
CTY/IND	55%	11%	11%	11%	22%	3.4	--	--	12%	12%	76%	1.4	9
CC	15%	28%	28%	28%	--	3.3	--	14%	28%	14%	44%	2.1	7

Predictably, each sector reported having benefited most from technical assistance provided by their own agency: SDAs from OTEP, Voc Ed institutions from DOE. Among Voc Ed institutions, COMPHSs rated DOE and OTEP assistance most highly (3.8-2.6). RVTSs, CTY/INDs and CCs felt they had benefited more than moderately (3.3-3.4) from DOE assistance and relatively little from OTEP (1.4-2.1). Although SDAs felt they benefited more from OTEP technical assistance on coordination then from DOE, they rated benefits from both sectors relatively low: OTEP - 2.4, DOE - 1.5.

Respondents were asked to indicate further which of eight kinds of technical assistance they had used or received from DOE and OTEP. Their reports are indicated in Table 28.

TABLE 28: TYPES OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

X denotes kinds of technical assistance reported by more than 25% of respondents in the sector

X+ denotes kinds of technical assistance reported by more than 50% of respondents in the sector.

TYPE	DOE Assistance					OTEP Assistance				
	SDA	CC	RVTS	CTY	COMPHS	SDA	CC	RVTS	CTY	COMPHS
Planning		X	X+	X	X+	X+				
Plan Review	X	X+	X+	X+	X+	X+				
Access Funding		X+	X+	X+	X+	X		X		
Evaluation		X	X+	X	X+	X+				
Enrollment & Capacity Info		X	X	X	X+	X				X
Labor Market Information		X	X	X	X+	X+		X		X
Curriculum Development		X	X+	X+	X+					
Special Needs			X	X	X+					

In summary, SDA and Voc Ed respondents offered a mixed report on the extent to which they utilized potential communication channels and practices mandated for improving coordination. In general, it does not appear that formal planning mandates actually promote coordination in most locales. Neither the mandate for SDA review of Voc Ed Perkins funding applications nor for SDAs to be provided lists of all Perkins funded programs are perceived as very helpful currently. Furthermore, there is a gap between SDAs' belief that they are including Voc Ed in plan review and mailings and Voc Ed institutions' perception that they are not usually included. Yet, only a few SDAs, schools or colleges reported that they had undertaken a more proactive approach, adopting institutional criteria or identifying staff specifically responsible for coordination. Such institutional commitments to coordinate are constrained by limits on resources and by competing priorities.

SECTION D: MEMBERSHIP

This segment of the study looked at exchange of members between SDA/PIC and Voc Ed schools and colleges on three kinds of bodies: PIC Boards, Pic Education Sub-Committees and School/College Vocational Advisory Committees.

Of these, public education representation on the PIC is the only exchange mandated at the local level; even this law does not stipulate that representatives must be from Voc Ed or any particular sector of education. Membership exchange offers one potentially effective vehicle for ongoing communication between SDAs and Voc Ed institutions and can also provide less paper-driven, more responsive channels for input into planning than some described in Section C.

PIC Membership

SDA REPORTS:

Among the eight SDAs participating in the study, the average number of education representatives on PIC Boards was 4.4 (ranging from two to seven). Because some PICs include representatives of local private colleges and universities, the number of public education representatives on the PIC averaged 3.8.

Total PIC Membership ranged from 21 to 44, averaging 29. Total public sector representation on PICs ranged between 16% and 45%; JTPA requires that PICs have a private sector majority. Table 29 lists public education membership reported by eight SDAs.

TABLE 29: SDA REPORTS ON PIC MEMBERSHIP

# PIC Members	CC	RVTS, CTY/IND	COMPHS
-0-	1	4	2
-1-	7	2	2
-2-	0	2	1
-3-	0	0	3

All PICs but one reported having a CC President or designee as a Board member. Half reported a Vocational or Voc-Tech School administrator (usually Director or Superintendent Director), and half of these (2) had more than one representative from a secondary vocational school. All PICs have at least one non-vocational secondary superintendent sitting as a member, and many have more than one. Information on procedures for nomination and replacement of education representatives to PICs was also requested. For almost every PIC, nominations and replacements are made through the PIC itself. Often outgoing education representatives are asked to recommend their own replacement--usually from the same institution--or other PIC members are asked for recommendations. It is also common that the Mayor of the lead city in the SDA is asked to choose or approve an education representative.

PIC Membership

VOC ED REPORTS:

Voc Ed respondents were asked whether they or any other representative of their institutions were PIC members. Although there was not geographic congruence between SDA and Voc Ed respondents, overall results corresponded: nearly all CCs reported PIC membership. Not quite half of RVTS respondents are on the PIC, while only two of 10 CTY/IND respondents are (this distinction was not made in SDA data). Table 30 lists Voc Ed reports on PIC membership.

TABLE 30: VOC ED REPORTS ON PIC MEMBERSHIP

Sector	% With Membership	Title	N
CC	88%	President/Designee	8
RVTS	40%	Supt./Director	15
COMPHS	30%	Superintendent Director Occ Ed	10
CTY/IND	20%	Superintendent	10

Voc Ed institutions were also asked if they had ever attempted to join the PIC and what the outcome of the attempt had been. Almost every Voc Ed respondent reported that he/she had made at least one attempt to place a member on the PIC; about half of the outcomes had resulted in membership. Negative outcomes to seeking PIC membership were very often experienced by schools as being ignored or rebuffed; some instances were attributed to another institution's or sector's favored status. Yet, schools not represented on a PIC reported a very low instance of maintaining regular contact with education representatives who sit on the PIC.

Clearly, PIC Membership is viewed by schools and colleges as the best potential channel for communicating with SDAs and offering input into the local employment training system. Although a few institutions reported offering assistance to committees or specific programs (with varying degrees of success), many saw failure to gain membership on the PIC as a frustrating dead end to their efforts to participate in planning. One view expressed was that PICs should seek more members from Voc Ed sectors. Certainly, narrow procedures for filling membership vacancies should be examined.

But to be functional, PICs average under 30 total members, and JTPA mandates that the majority of these members must be from the private sector and that a range of other public interests be represented. Survey results indicated that PICs currently average fewer than four public education members, and few vacancies arise. Relying on appointment of a PIC Board member to provide an institution's primary channel for input into employment training planning seems unnecessarily restrictive.

Education Committees and Sub-Committees

Five of eight SDAs (63%) surveyed reported that their PIC has established a Committee or Sub-Committee charged specifically with ccordinating Educational Issues. SDAs listed Education Committees, Education Coordination/Linkage Committees, or Agency Liaison Sub-Committees as the focus for these activities. One SDA reported that its Planning Committee included education representatives and carries out coordinating functions. Most of these bodies include educators who are representatives from community-based organizations and community agencies. Some are standing committees and meet monthly or bimonthly, while others meet only two to four times each year. Many of these bodies were orginally constituted to plan for the first Eight Percent Education Coordination grant proposals in 1985.

Only about one-third of secondary Voc Ed administrators reported committee participation, while more than half of CCs were invloved. Table 31 illustrates Voc Ed involvement in PIC committees.

TABLE 31: VOC ED INSTITUTIONS ON PIC COMMITTEES

Sector	% Participating	Participant Titles	N
CC	56%	Director Institutional Dev./ Dean Continuing Education	9
RVTS	27%	Superintendent/Director	15
COMPHS	30%	Superintendent/Dir. Occ. Ed./ Director Federal Programs	10
CTY/IND	30%	Superintendent	10

Within these limits, a variety of patterns for participating in such committees was indicated, ranging from very active to largely pro forma involvement. Some institutions reported having several staff members serving on different PIC groups and committees. In particular, schools and colleges with members on the PICs usually also had at least one other staff person serving as a permanent committee member. A number of institutions also work with PIC sponsored Business-Education Task Forces or Advisory Groups.

A few schools reported continuous involvement at the committee level both in planning and overseeing programs, particularly school-based and business partnerships. At the proactive end, one Occupational Education Director at a COMPHS, who is a PIC Member, is currently chairing a group "to provide more information on Voc Ed and CC perspectives on JTPA and experience with the RFP process." Most Voc Ed institutions, however, participate on a more periodic or "as-needed" basis--for example, to respond to Eight Percent fund RFPs or to plan Summer Youth programs. Voc Ed institutions stated they had little input into setting the agenda. Some also expressed frustration that repeated offers of Voc Ed resources and participation in planning were accepted only rarely. A number of respondents viewed committees as pro forma, serving primarily to fulfill state planning requirements, meeting only

at the last minute before proposals need to be submitted. Several institutions cited this as a reason for declining invitations to participate.

Some PIC education committees remain limited to their original function, serving only as planning groups for Eight Percent funding proposals or for specific programs serving in-school youth. While this behavior may meet PIC needs, it is frustrating for those Voc Ed institutions seeking broader input into planning. Yet, Education committees, in some localities, have served as effective vehicles for Voc Ed/JTPA coordination--as forums for regular dialogue and broader education input into joint employment training planning. In areas where there is mutual commitment to coordination, education committees seem to be a key point of linkage between the two systems.

Vocational Advisory Committees

Vocational general and program advisory committees represent a third existing forum for communication between the Voc Ed and JTPA sectors at the local level. Given these committees' responsibilities for advising on vocational program planning, they seem a particularly direct channel for SDAs and PICs to learn about, and offer input into, Voc Ed systems. Furthermore, in the past several years, DOE has devoted considerable effort to working with these committees on improving their effectiveness. Half of the eight SDA respondents reported that they are represented on Voc Ed general or program advisory committees. Two are on CC Voc Ed Advisory Boards, and one is on the General Advisory Committee of a city vocational high school. One other SDA formed a special group to advise a literacy program.

Nearly half of the CCs and RVTSs surveyed also had SDA or PIC representation on their advisory bodies, while only 20% of COMPHSs and 10% of CTY/INDs in the sample reported PIC participation (See Table 32).

TABLE 32: VOC ED ADVISORY COMMITTEES WITH PIC MEMBERS

Sector	% With PIC Representation	N
CC	43%	7
RVTS	47%	15
COMPHS	10%	10
CTY/IND	20%	10

SECTION E: BENEFITS AND COSTS OF COORDINATION

This study did not assume that coordination is necessarily a wholly positive or desirable effort for the administrators and agencies involved. The local survey asked SDA and Voc Ed respondents to identify what the benefits and costs of attempted coordination have been for their institution and to assess whether it has been worth the cost.

Nine potential benefits of coordination were adapted from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education's survey instrument. Participants were asked whether coordination efforts had yielded specified benefits for their institutions and, where possible, to describe those benefits. Table 33 lists the percentage of respondents from SDAs and each Voc Ed sector who stated specific benefits from coordination efforts.

TABLE 33: RESPONDENTS BENEFITING FROM COORDINATION

Benefits	SDA	CC	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS
Increased # participants	29%	63%	38%	30%	38%
Increased funds	29%	63%	46%	20%	38%
Increased staff quality	0%	50%	23%	0%	38%
Increased service variety	57%	63%	23%	0%	38%
Increased facilities	29%	38%	8%	0%	12%
Reduced duplication	14%	38%	23%	20%	25%
Increased recruitment	43%	75%	38%	10%	50%
Curriculum design aid	29%	25%	8%	0%	12%
Shared labor market infor	14%	25%	31%	30%	25%
	(N=7)	(N=8)	(N=13)	(N=10)	(N=8)

(percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple possible responses)

Many respondents reported that they had benefited from coordination efforts, and some kinds of benefits were shared across sectors. CCs reported the widest variety of benefits--including

increased numbers of participants, increased recruitment and referral, increased funding, staff and range of services--as well as the highest percentage perceived benefits from coordination efforts. Approximately half of the SDA administrators surveyed believe they have gained an increased range of services and increased recruitment and cross referral from coordination efforts. Several SDAs also reported increased numbers of participants and increased funding, facilities and equipment, and curriculum design assistance.

RVTS respondents focused on increased funding, number of participants, and recruitment/referrals as primary benefits derived from coordination. COMPHSs reported these same benefits, along with increased staff and range of services. Clearly, respondents from the CTY/IND sector have experienced minimal benefit from coordination--fewer than other sectors.

Perceived benefits are by definition highly subjective, and it cannot be assumed that participants seek from coordination only the kinds of benefits they have experienced in the past. But, identifying benefits and costs to each sector of coordination efforts is an important prerequisite to developing 'win-win' local coordination efforts. There was near unanimity across the sectors that, so far, coordination costs have been few--mostly staff time--and have been worth the effort. Only two CTY/IND participants cited specific costs, stating that their previous attempts to coordinate were not worth the staff time or the financial investment.

SECTION F: DESIRABILITY/FEASIBILITY

The last segment of the survey questionnaire tried to move beyond current perceptions and practices to look at possible avenues for state policy initiatives to encourage and facilitate local-level coordination. There were four policy-related questions. One question sought to identify state and/or federal laws, regulations or policies that impede coordination efforts. A second question solicted input from SDA and Voc Ed administrators on how desirable and feasible it is to expect extensive local Voc Ed/JTPA coordination in 10 possible areas of activity. A third asked them to evaluate the potential effectiveness for facilitating local coordination of 10 different kinds of state level interventions. Finally, an open-ended question asked respondents to state any comments, recommendations or observations on Voc Ed/JTPA coordination efforts and efforts at coordination improvement.

State and Federal Impediments to Coordination

In addition to identifying perceptions and practices that currently discourage local coordination, it seemed important to identify the more intractable policy and regulatory barriers. In Section A, differences in respective definitions of allowable services and budgetary items emerged as one of the more discouraging factors for nearly all sectors (Table 7). Yet, policy and regulation did not emerge as overwhelming or impossible to work around. Some respondents in each sector identified specific regulatory or policy barriers to coordination, although only in the SDA sector a majority of administrators offered thoughts on these (88%). Only one SDA commented

that it could not identify such barriers, since it "believes people must work around regulations and find common concerns and issues and address them to best meet client needs."

Fewer than half of the Voc Ed respondents pointed to specific impediments from state and/or federal policy. Among CC, COMPHS and CTY/IND respondents, between a third and a half identified regulatory or policy barriers, and only one in each sector saw no such barriers. Two-thirds of the RVTS sector answered the question on identifying legal and regulatory barriers to coordination, but half of these responded that none exist. Policy barriers identified by SDA respondents centered on four factors:

1. JTPA eligibility requirements (particularly income) as limiting the flexibility of JTPA programming;
2. differences in systems' goals and target populations that make them less compatible;
3. complexities of both systems' regulations that make it difficult to develop expertise in both;
4. JTPA performance standards, particularly cost limits and required placement wages.

CCs also identified JTPA client eligibility requirements and performance-based contracting as barriers. They also named the fact that JTPA does not recognize enrollment in postsecondary programs as positive termination, and the fact that DOE restricts college use of DOE funds. One respondent pointed to "fragmentation of the education, employment and training systems at the state agency level" as a major obstacle, stating that "too many state agencies are involved; we need a consolidation, reorganization."

RVTSs as well identified SDA/PIC performance standards (particularly outcome measures that exclude postsecondary enrollment) and JTPA's five percent administrative cap as major factors impeding local coordination. Several RVTS administrators added to this list the restrictions disallowing the use of JTPA funding as a match for Perkins funds (even though Perkins can serve as a match for JTPA). Two RVTS respondents, as well as two COMPHS Occupational Directors, focused on the concept of 'right of first refusal,' which interprets JTPA as allowing public education agencies first rights to JTPA service delivery. Two administrators saw the problem as a need for clarification or interpretation of this section of JTPA, while two others defined it as "JTPA agency resistance" to these rights. Another respondent included "the RFP process" as a barrier. Others commented that "people and geographical boundaries" posed bigger problems than laws and regulation.

CTY/IND and COMPHS responses focused on the Perkins matching requirements as the main obstacle. One commented that "present performance standards make better coordination difficult, not impossible."

Desirable and Feasible Local Coordination Activities

The local questionnaire solicited input from SDA and Voc Ed administrators on the desirability and feasibility of expecting extensive local coordination in 10 areas of activity which were adapted from the survey instruments of the National Center's coordination study. Respondents were asked to rate each listed area of coordinated activity on a scale of one to five, ranging from not at all desirable/feasible to very desirable/feasible. "Don't Know" was also

offered as a possible response. Respondents were asked to differentiate between desirability and feasibility.

The four activities each sector judged most desirable to coordination at the local level are listed in Table 34. The four highest rated activities are listed together here to illustrate the extensive agreement that exists across SDAs and Voc Ed institutions on what kinds of coordination ought to be issued at the local level. Complete breakouts for each sector's ratings on the desirability of coordinating activities locally are in Appendix F.

TABLE 34: MOST DESIRABLE LOCAL COORDINATION ACTIVITIES
1 (Not at all) - 5 (Very)

Sector SDA	Activity	$\bar{X}$
	Sharing local labor market information	4.6
	Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.5
	Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	4.1
	Joint funding of programs	3.6
CC		
	Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.6
	Sharing local labor market information	4.4
	Joint or reciprocal staff development	4.4
	Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	4.4
RVTS		
	Sharing local labor market information	4.2
	Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.2
	Joint funding of programs	3.7
	Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	3.6
CTY/IND		
	Sharing local labor market information	4.6
	Joint preparation of local service plans	4.1
	Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.0
	Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	3.6
COMPHS		
	Joint funding of programs	4.7
	Sharing local labor market information	4.6
	Joint operation of programs	4.4
	Joint or reciproal technical assistance	4.4

Even more than the motivational factors reported in Section A and the benefits reported in Section D, these responses confirm that most SDAs and Voc Ed institutions hold very similar agendas for local coordination activities. Of the 10 activities listed, virtually all sectors rated the same four activities as the most desirable for local coordination. Similarly, nearly all respondents put the same two activities, "joint intake and assessment procedures for participants" and "joint program evaluation," at the bottom of their lists. It is also notable that all sectors rated most of the 10 activities on the positive end of the scale. SDAs ranked only one activity below three, while Voc Ed rated all coordination activities as more desirable than not. Certainly, these priorities are best analyzed in their local context by the local Voc Ed institutions and employment training agencies concerned.

The feasibility ratings for these same activities fell roughly in the same rank order as desirability, with slightly lower ratings overall. There were several activities for which respondents perceived a discrepency in desirability and feasibility--always with the activity rated less feasible than desirable.

No single activity had widely divergent desirability/feasibility ratings across sectors. Reciprocal referral procedures was widely named as one of the most desirable activities for local coordination. It was rated on average considerably more desirable than feasible by CCs (4.6 and 3.3, respectively) and CTY/INDs (4.0 and 2.5, respectively). CCs also viewed "Joint or Reciprocal Staff Development Activities" as more desirable than feasible (4.4 and 3.0, respectively), while CTY/IND schools saw a gap between desirability and feasibility of "Joint Preparation of Local Services Plans" (4.1 and 2.6, respectively).

Value of Possible State Initiatives

A third policy oriented question asked respondents to evaluate whether they felt each of 10 other possible state level interventions would effectively facilitate local JTPA/Voc Ed coordination. (Response choices were Yes, No, Don't Know.) The 10 interventions were drawn from the National Center's survey instruments. There was space to write in additional methods (as there was also in the previous question), but very few participants utilized it.

Four of the suggested state level actions were viewed by local administrators as potentially very favorable for facilitating local coordination. Although the question did not ask for ratings or rankings, responses are grouped in Table 35 as Positive, Middle Range or Negative, according to percentages of respondents who judged them affirmatively.

Again, the value of this information is that it highlights the convergence of opinion across sectors on the value of promoting local level coordination of some commonly suggested state policy interventions. Options rated least favorable were those involving major bureaucratic or logistical changes: exchange or co-location of staff, interagency committees, co-terminious planning districts. Those rated highest were more concrete or activity oriented: sharing labor market planning information, technical assistance, interagency agreements, and joint meetings. Most stated priorities for state actions mirror priorities for local coordination list in Table 34. It is possible that different priorities would emerge in different localities out of an ongoing process of local level JTPA/Voc Ed dialogue.

TABLE 35: DESIRABILITY OF STATE ACTIVITIES

Activity	Percent Positive Response				
POSITIVE	SDA	CC	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS
Sharing labor market information	88%	100%	79%	90%	89%
Reciprocal technical assistance	100%	89%	64%	90%	78%
Non financial inter-agency agreements	88%	67%	93%	60%	56%
Joint staff meetings	50%	89%	79%	80%	89%
Joint service plans	63%	89%	71%	70%	44%
Financial agreements	75%	33%	71%	70%	56%
MIDDLE RANGE					
Interagency Committee	50%	56%	64%	40%	67%
Co-terminous planning districts	50%	56%	57%	20%	44%
NEGATIVE					
Exchange of staff	38%	33%	7%	20%	33%
Co-location of staff	25%	22%	29%	30%	67%

Respondent Comments

This chapter has presented significant findings from the Council's recent research on local perceptions and practices relating to JTPA/Voc Ed coordination. In a final question, survey respondents were asked to share additional comments, recommendations or observations on the current state of Voc Ed/JTPA coordination or efforts to improve it. Some representative comments are offered here to give the flavor of general concerns about coordination, and as an appropriate close to this chapter.

SDA COMMENTS:

> I believe coordination of these efforts has improved over the past few years. Employment and Training staff and Voc Ed faculty must collaborate with each other and recognize that they are all educators and their goals are the same--a prepared and educated work force.

There is no information on Carl Perkins Vocational funding. There should be a pool of Voc Ed money established that allows every SDA to develop joint programs with Voc Ed by putting up local JTPA dollars. This might promote the development of joint Voc Ed/SDA training programs during daytime hours, with existing resources targeted at Adult JTPA and Welfare populations.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMENTS:

Currently there is no coordination between state educational agencies at this level, or within this area. JTPA funding has been funded and is furnished locally through the same agencies for years without much effort to coordinate and eliminate unnecessary duplication.

To be honest, a big factor is the limited time staff have for these coordination efforts. I believe in coordination, but if you are carrying out a busy job, it's hard to always coordinate with others as a highest priority.

REGIONAL VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMENTS:

Voc Ed/JTPA coordination works very well (here) on a limited basis due to financial constraints and the SDA's own skill center. The RVTS is always ready to design and implement retraining programs for the SDA as requested.

For the summer of 1987, we are a worksite for two students and are operating a career exploratory component for 60-80 youth. This came about through personal contacts and was arranged quite informally. We have both the capacity and the willingness to provide slots during the regular day program. Efforts to develop better coordination are just getting under-way, as my appointment here was (just) effective.

We have not had opportunities to serve this type of partner-ship. We would be interested in it.

Best current hope is the SCOVE sponsored Voc Ed plus Community College plus JTPA planning. Need to create state incentives for the process.

I believe there exists a lack of basic information within JTPA agencies regarding vocational education, its purposes, resources and capacity. Also, there does not appear to be willingness or interest to pursue this information.

I feel we have different purposes. Our mission is Education, their's is training. I sense they want to operate as a separate entity.

One RVTs included a list of specific administrative recommendations in the final comments:

1. Voc Ed task force efforts have been very valuable.
2. Eight Percent money must be directed to coordination, not direct service.
3. 'Literacy' funds should be controlled by DOE, not JTPA.
4. Skills training programs at public Vocational facilities should be allowed higher per student costs than non-skills originated programs, both during the school year and in the summer.
5. Each funded/written proposal for JTPA monies should be allowed additional funds to cover the extensive fiscal accounting requirements of JTPA/SDA/CC.
6. The 5% administrative CAP on proposals should be raised to at least 15-20%.
7. 'Family of one' status should have more wide scope and interpretation.
8. There should be no 'caps' on handicapped enrollment.

CITY AND INDEPENDENT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL COMMENTS:

The present system does not work very effectively, too many vocational schools left out. Many of the key players have an intellectual bias against Voc Ed while many adults lose out on the good paying jobs in such areas as...printing, construction. PIC/SDAs run their own programs...with no vocational components. Collaborative efforts exclude Voc Ed by design and by philosophy.

1. Lessen the friction between DOE and OTEP (state agencies);
2. cite examples of where Voc Ed and JTPA are working;
3. provide technical assistance to help foster collaboration between the PIC, SDA and School Department around vocational training.

With shrinking funding, why run a skill center if programs are available in vocational schools and space is available? Duplication of effort and tying up funds that could service more.

In our SDA, I believe the educational training portion for the most part can be done on an individual referral basis. This is based on the fact that we do not have a great number of clients with the same education needs; therefore it is better to refer them to local community colleges, independent schools and public vocational schools.

Voc Ed in a city school is geared for high school age students. The needs are different.

COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL COMMENTS:

Where does a local comprehensive high school with six Chapter 74 programs fit?

We have a desire to participate in this program, but we all have to get together.

Virtually no contact between JTPA at state, regional, or local levels. Establish dialogue. Help educators--not create bureaucratic red tape.

We have developed a comprehensive network of employers and funding agencies; JTPA/SDA has been an equal partner in this effort... an ideal relationship.

More and stronger representation on PIC by member of Voc Ed community. Priority given to Voc Ed training sites with a joint financial incentive. Need to acquaint Vocational Education community with RFP process and differences in language; i.e. pre-vocational to SDAs means remedial education - to vocational educators it means exploratory. Incentives for SDA to stop using the same agencies as vendors... or the training agencies they have developed in-house from years past. In general, there need to be directives, incentives, and increased communication to foster collaboration. SDAs in general I feel have a negative feeling towards most public school environments because they are dealing with clients who have failed in that setting. Local employment plans and goals for both agencies (SDA & Voc Ed) also need to dove-tail to ensure joint activities.

There has been a long history of cooperation, interaction and sharing of various resources between our District and the SDA. This is based on mutual appreciation of the needs of the economically disadvantaged, mutual trust and an understanding of the limits and potential of each agency as they are governed by State and Federal regulations.

CHAPTER TWO

REGIONAL LEVEL FINDINGS

As part of the study on coordination between the Voc Ed and Employment Training systems in Massachusetts, seven regional agency staff from education and employment training were interviewed between July 31 and August 13, 1987. Interviews lasted from thirty to seventy-five minutes and were conducted by telephone.

In talking about coordination, DOE regional Employment Training and Education (ET & E) staff--who are attached to the Division of Occupational Education--focused largely on Voc Ed coordination. Whereas, OTEP regional managers spoke more often about coordination with education in general, rather than identifying coordination issues specific to Voc Ed. OTEP regional staff also expressed considerably more optimism about the direction Voc Ed/Employment Training coordination has been taking than all but one of the DOE regional staff.

Changes: CETA to JTPA

Of the three DOE regional staff who had also worked under CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act), only one felt that coordination had improved substantially--that present working relationships were building on previous 'learning experiences' of trying to coordinate with the other system. The other two were 'very disappointed' in the extent of coordination that was taking place under JTPA. The one OTEP regional manager who had worked at the program level under CETA characterized Voc Ed coordination under JTPA as 'definitely higher.'

Agency Role in Promoting Coordination

When asked about their own roles in promoting coordination at the local level, DOE regional ET & E specialists described their primary role as developing a personal connection to both the Voc Ed community and the JTPA system. A number of the coordination activities they undertook involved educating Voc Ed administrators about JTPA and the PIC, including how they can serve on the PIC or its sub-committees, access and share resources, participate in planning and advising on service to specific populations, and market their programs and services to the PIC. Two of the four DOE regional staff stated that their coordination work emphasized 'broad-based inclusion in local planning' more than formal exchange of members. The largest part of these efforts occurred at the time of JTPA enactment, although some have continued periodically. A second major kind of DOE regional staff activity was aimed at building relationships with SDA staff. One interviewee made the point that, to be effective, DOE staff must be viewed by the SDAs as the primary link with the Vocational Community and as a reliable channel for information on Voc Ed.

OTEP regional managers saw their own role in coordination less as establishing personal relationships between SDAs and Voc Ed and more as channels for state communication and feedback to SDAs. OTEP regional staff described coordination roles that included: passing on information about federal coordination mandates; state policy incentives & planning requirements; and monitoring performance, with particular emphasis on PIC membership and Eight Percent RFP requirements.

Agency Emphases on Coordination

Interviewees were asked how much emphasis they believed their agencies place on coordination, whether they think this emphasis is sufficient, and to what extent the agency plan could serve as a framework for coordination. A wide range of opinions was expressed by regional staff in both agencies, from the belief of some DOE and OTEP respondents that their own agency puts tremendous emphasis on state level coordination efforts and ought to continue to do so to the belief that this is either a futile (DOE) or an ineffective (OTEP) means to achieve local level coordination.

One DOE regional ET & E specialist felt that DOE, in recent years, has placed a 'tremendous emphasis' on coordination, citing increased DOE funding available for coordination and staff time devoted to working out coordinated programs and funding modes, especially for target populations such as displaced workers (former Postsecondary Bureau Director Phyllis Lary's work in particular was noted). A second respondent believed DOE was doing all it could to encourage coordination, but that 'turf issues' and lack of OTEP commitment block it. This individual stated that even where DOE tries to promote coordination, the regional staff is "by-passed and blocked within her or his own department" and not recognized as valuable for planning coordination or for making it work.

Two other DOE regional interviewees believed that regional staff and local educators receive mixed signals on coordination from the state level. Although some local agencies have made commitments to JTPA/Voc Ed coordination, to be systemic a state level commitment must be initiated. In this view, locals will comply with state mandates if the definition of coordination is clearer, if technical assistance and funds are made available, and if planning efforts identify and integrate the

people who can actually implement coordination in both systems. One respondent felt education should be a higher priority in the Governor's JTPA Coordination Plan, while DOE planning should take the lead on literacy and dropouts. However, another regional DOE staff person was doubtful that agency plans are the best frameworks for coordination; efforts should focus more on educating both communities on mutual needs and requirements.

OTEP regional staff all agreed that coordination is a high agency priority, but differed on the extent to which they believe their state agency plan can or should promote local coordination. One held that OTEP's coordination effort has already grown from an initial focus on Eight Percent funding procedures to looking now at JTPA core funds. In this view, the agency plan can serve as a vehicle for setting general system coordination goals and for emphasizing means to coordinate existing resources and eliminate duplication. A second OTEP regional manager stated the belief that the agency requires as much coordination as it can, but that coordination cannot be mandated in a decentralized system such as JTPA; OTEP can only encourage coordination by supplying information and resources. In this person's view, other agencies, such as DOE, must also take more initiative to make it work. The third OTEP respondent believed that state agency intervention has very limited potential to promote coordination since "the real issue is at the local level."

Definitions of Effective JTPA/Voc Ed Coordination

All of the definitions of effective interagency coordination offered by regional DOE and OTEP staff focused on either joint regional planning of joint program planning. Yet, these concepts grew out of quite different visions of the optimal relationship between the two

systems. Two DOE respondents focused on regional planning, one stating,

> Within the framework of joint planning, we need a shared arrangement where the overall mission of each agency is not threatened. Create a Regional Planning Group structure that recognizes separate agency missions and whose role is accepted by all. It can develop a Regional Plan to bridge State and local efforts.

The Executive Office of Human Services' regional planning groups, which bring together seven to eight agencies quarterly to work locally on human services, was offered as an example of a successful planning body.

Two OTEP regional managers also focused on joint planning, offering PIC committees as appropriate vehicles for exchanging information and gathering data as well as for defining local problems, division of responsibilities, and plans for action. Regional staff from both agencies would, in this view, offer ongoing technical assistance, information on resources and feedback, and would ensure broad-based involvement in the PIC committees. One respondent stated the expectation that much of this will happen naturally around the new federal requirements for JTPA summer youth programs to include remedial academic components.

Two other DOE regional respondents described jointly planned, funded and staffed programs as the essence of local coordination. They emphasized the importance of initiating bottom-up, rather than top-down, planning for such joint programs. A fourth DOE respondent also emphasized joint funding and programming, but also believes that collaborative technical assistance is an important prerequisite and that it should identify exemplary programs and models for sharing funding and resources. Ongoing and direct Voc Ed/SDA information channels were also seen as important for helping schools to understand the SDA and how it operates.

OTEP respondents who defined coordination primarily as joint programming offered two very different rationales. One respondent believed that the key to combining resources and avoiding duplication is to view Voc Ed and employment training as "one total system," with vocational schools contracting to enroll a specific number of JTPA clients annually and developing more open entry/open exit courses to do so and incentives built in to encourage SDAs to use vocational school programs wherever possible. A second OTEP regional manager advocated joint programming, but with more schools and colleges actively pursuing funds through the existing competitive RFP process, meeting all JTPA performance standards.

Effectiveness of Current Coordination

When asked to rate the effectiveness of current JTPA/Voc Ed coordination, most respondents in both sectors concurred that it is, on average, only slightly effective. Several made the point that it is not very helpful to rate general effectiveness as it usually ranges widely across SDAs within one OTEP or DOE region from ineffective to quite effective.

FACTORS PRODUCING EFFECTIVE COORDINATION:

Most DOE and OTEP interviewees identified good personal relationships among local Voc Ed and SDA staff as perhaps the key factor for producing effective coordination. Important elements in such relationships included: one-on-one dialogue to break down misperceptions and share information; commitment to understand each other's needs and to negotiate; agreement on end goals; and readiness to be flexible and to share resources. Several respondents also stated that it is important to

involve 'line staff' from both agencies in determining state coordination policy. One OTEP respondent applauded vocational administrators' increased willingness to be flexible and to try to work with the JTPA system.

One DOE respondent believed that effective working relationships are most likely to emerge in areas where there are more disadvantaged students--where schools and SDAs serve converging clientele and view themselves as advocates for these clients. A second DOE interviewee viewed geographical proximity as an important issue, with coordination more likely to emerge in small SDAs or rural areas. A third DOE regional ET & E specialist offered the opinion that coordination works best where vocational schools and CCs are most actively taking initiative in participating in employment training planning and service delivery. Only one of the four DOE regional staff saw state coordination efforts as providing the essential impetus for local coordination.

Although they did not see their own role as focusing on relationships, all OTEP regional managers agreed that good working relationships among local SDAs is the most important factor in promoting local coordination. They also offered several additional factors. Two believed that the lack of a 'politicized' climate or 'turf' was important for coordination. SDAs which do not have skill centers and which have education coordination committees were also viewed as more likely to work towards coordinating with Voc Ed. The willingness of Vocational Schools and CCs to compete in the JTPA RFP process was viewed as an essential factor by one respondent, who also emphasized the key importance of state agencies making funds available and requiring a coordinated planning process (as for Eight Percent funding).

There was little agreement among interview participants on the program areas in which coordination has been most effective. One DOE staff respondent identified adult programming, where vocational schools are cost-effective, as the most effective area for coordination. Two OTEP respondents agreed that Voc Ed institutions most effectively provide skill training--through competitive RFPs, selling slots or mainstreaming clients in regular classes. One OTEP respondent identified literacy and remedial education as services SDAs look more and more to CCs to provide. Conversely, one DOE respondent and one OTEP respondent identified services to youth--in-school and dropouts as well as referrals to summer youth programs--as the most effective forms of coordination.

FACTORS HINDERING COORDINATION:

Both DOE and OTEP systems identified 'turf issues' as the primary barrier to coordination, as did the majority of local level SDA and Voc Ed respondents. Beyond this issue, there was little agreement either within or across DOE and OTEP regional staff as to discouraging factors. Other discouraging factors named included:

DOE

- lack of state leadership, financial and non-financial agreements;
- lack of linkages between state, regional and local levels;
- lack of DOE initiatives on issues such as literacy;
- schools lack experience of working with JTPA performance standards and eligibility criteria;
- no JTPA understanding of vocational schools realities and problems
- misperceptions on both sides;

OTEP

- lack of funds and staff to do collaborative planning;
- vocational schools inaccessible, not equipped for recruitment or job placement;
- need for more Voc Ed initiative in making contact--not yet willing to be entrepreneurial, compete and meet performance standards, fill vacuums;
- lack of flexibility on both sides--view that they are competing systems, not parts of one system;
- where SDAs run own programs, are not open to alternatives;
- requirements for separate administrative treatment of funds.

Agency Efforts to Facilitate Local Coordination

Doe and OTEP regional staff were asked to identify organizational or operational changes their own and the other agency had made to facilitate local coordination. DOE staff identified as positive steps:

- staff time invested to identify needs and design programs;
- development of competitive RFPs requiring schools to deligate coordination with SDAs;
- creation of programs like Commonwealth Futures to promote innovative use of funds for dropouts and at-risk youth.

However, more DOE regional staff's comments related to needed agency efforts, including:

- more institutionalization of communications;
- procedures for more in-depth OTEP review of state and local plans;
- need to strengthen SDA annual plan requirement and to solicit DOE input into these.

One DOE respondent felt much more fundamental changes were needed before coordination would be possible. In this view, because DOE is not included in employment training decisions at the state or local levels, there is not much it can do to promote coordination.

OTEP regional staff pointed more often to concrete policies and programs they regard as agency efforts favoring coordination. The YCC

and the way it administers Eight Percent funding, Commonwealth Futures, the new Cabinet Level Education and Employment Coordinating Council (CLEECC), and the involvement of education and Voc Ed in JTPA summer programs were all identified as positive developments coming largely as a result of OTEP efforts. OTEP also cited DOE efforts to get OTEP input into recent Literacy Grants.

Among areas where agencies need to do more, OTEP respondents focused on state involvement in targeting funds. Two OTEP regional staff emphasized this point, one stating that it is:

> hard to deal with institutional change at the State level; it works better when local people are putting together specific programs. SDAs find it easier to work with individual schools than with the State Department of Education.

In this view, the most OTEP can do is to create an environment and establish a forum for discussion. One OTEP interviewee went even further, stating the opinion that vocational schools must learn to compete in the existing JTPA system, according to existing rules:

> If they can serve the hardest-to-serve clients and place them in jobs according to JTPA performance standards, then they are part of the employment training system and belong at the planning table.

Eight Percent Fund Impact on Coordination Quality

There was a divergence of views between DOE and OTEP regional staff on the effects of Eight Percent Education Coordination funding on overall systemic coordination. OTEP saw this as a very positive force, stating that in many locales, the 1984 Eight Percent funding proposal brought broad education representation to the planning table for the first time. In some cases, that original relationship has been institutionalized in a permanent Education Coordinating Committee. One OTEP regional staff

differentiated between Eight Percent funding's affect on coordination planning and on coordinated implementation. This interviewee expressed the opinion that it is invariably harder than planning, but that the experience of working out coordination issues arising during Eight Percent implementation are most effective for building working relationships because they involve line staff.

DOE respondents saw Eight Percent education funding as either a neutral or a negative force on local coordination. One DOE regional staff respondent stated that the first year of Eight Percent funding really mandated coordinated planning, but subsequent years have been largely controlled from the center, with no provision for regional input or targeting local priorities. Three DOE interviewees felt that DOE had not had a strong role in Eight Percent planning, as they believed JTPA had intended for this particular funding allocation. They held that, where coordination is taking place, it is happening for other reasons; Eight Percent is not a driving force. One respondent put it even more strongly that DOE had been "cheated out of Eight Percent funding."

School and College Delivery of JTPA Services

There was also a split between DOE and OTEP regional staff perceptions of how much progress has been made in using secondary and postsecondary public Voc Ed institutions to deliver JTPA training and other services. OTEP respondents saw a lot of progress and anticipated that it would only get better. DOE regional staff felt there had been a little progress and that there were significant barriers to further improvement. Voc Ed inclusion in local planning was seen as a precondition for increasing delivery of services.

Two respondents pointed to divisions within Voc Ed which favor one sector--either Vocational Schools, CCs or COMPHSs in different localities--as a barrier to broad coordination which would maximize services to clients. One DOE regional ET & E specialist believed Voc Ed institutions will themselves have to consider some specific factors and changes to be able effectively to deliver services to JTPA clients. These factors are: scheduling, length of courses, recruitment ability, support services and placement of clients, and cost-effectiveness.

Desirable Local Coordinating Activities

Regional staff from both agencies were asked to respond to the same list of 10 possible activities for local coordination as were local administrators. (With only seven total regional responses, these were not broken out for JTPA and Voc Ed responses.) There was substantial agreement between regional and local assessments of the most and least desirable areas for pursuing local coordination. Regional responses were in agreement that "sharing local labor market information," "reciprocal referral procedures for participants" and "joint funding of programs" were very desirable. "Joint intake & assessment procedures for participants" and "joint follow-up" were judged to be the least desirable local coordination activities, as local respondents had also rated them. There were no factors for which there was marked disagreement between regional and local responses.

Desirable State Level Coordindation Efforts

Regional respondents were also asked to judge whether or not each of the 10 state level interventions presented in the local level survey would be likely to promote local Voc Ed/JTPA coordination. Again, regional interview responses virtually mirrored local survey responses.

Possible state efforts were judged as follows:

Positive
- Reciprocal of joint technical assistance sessions
- Sharing statewide labor information for planning
- Financial agreements, contracts and sub-contracts

Middle
- Joint or shared staff meetings
- Co-location of staff

Negative
- Exchange of staff
- Co-terminous planning districts

Respondent Comments

DOE regional ET & E specialists' final comments focused on the importance of state level efforts to define clearly what is meant by coordination. They suggested that leadership on coordination must include information on specific ways coordination can take place--perhaps in a guide to coordinating funds and practices. The DOE overall view ranged from quite pessimistic to slightly optimistic about prospects for local coordination.

OTEP regional managers, on the other hand, expressed considerable optimism about local coordination efforts. The three respondents held differing views on how OTEP and DOE could best facilitate local coordination, ranging from "creating a climate and incentives" to "staying out of the way." They also stressed the importance of private sector involvement and the accountability of both education and employment training sectors.

CHAPTER THREE

STATE LEVEL FINDINGS

As part of the study on coordination between the Voc Ed and employment training systems in Massachusetts, eight middle and top level state officials in DOE, EOEA and OTEP were interviewed. These interviews, which ranged in length from 30-90 minutes, were conducted in July, 1987. This chapter summarizes the dominant themes which emerged from the interviews with state level officials. A list of interview participants can be found in Appendix G.

Overall Status of Coordination

There was general consensus among the respondents that coordination between JTPA and Voc Ed in Massachusetts "has a long way to go" but has improved significantly over the last several years. Indeed, many forms of inter-agency cooperation are occurring now in state government, and Governor Dukakis strongly supports such collaboration. Many respondents pointed to the importance of the ET Choices program (and, to a lesser extent, the Bay State Skills Corporation) in providing a successful model of collaboration. The Welfare Department was singled out as a agency that is especially open to collaboration. Thus, the development of JTPA/Voc Ed ties should be seen in this broader context.

It is important to note that many of the respondents in this study had difficulty separating out Voc Ed from education in general in analyzing the links between JTPA and Voc Ed. More and more of the joint work that is occurring between OTEP and DOE is with divisions at DOE other than Occupational Education. The ties with Adult Education, for

example, are growing, and dropout prevention programs are aimed primarily at youth in the COMPHSs. Top DOE and OTEP officials think about education and training in a very broad way and do not particularly focus on the Voc Ed connection. This should be seen as a positive development because it indicates that officials are thinking in very comprehensive and creative terms.

Coordination Among Top Officials

At the very highest levels of management there is a new and exciting spirit of collaboration. Commissioner Raynolds of DOE, Chancellor Jennifer of the Board of Regents and Secretary Alviani of EOEA work well together and meet frequently. This did not happen with their predecessors. They also have a good relationship with Secretaries Johnston, Executive Office of Human Services, and Eustace, Executive Office of Labor, and the assistants to the Governor in the areas of education, human resources, and economic development. It is clear that coordination is a very high priority in these agencies. The formation of the new CLEECC appears to be a very promising vehicle for promoting further comprehensive joint planning. The proposal to institutionalize CLEECC will be made to the Governor and Legislature by December 31, 1987. This proposal will include plans to reconstitute the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) which is currently moribund.

Coordination Among Middle Managers

Middle managers at OTEP and DOE have much more contact with one another than they used to and are working together on a variety of programs. There are some frustrations and turf issues that create problems, but overall these do not present insurmountable barriers to collaboration. Everyone interviewed felt that the relationship between the two agencies was improving. As one OTEP official put it:

> If you look at how differently people behave in state government now, there is a big change. Five years ago, we didn't know names of people in other agencies and we didn't do joint planning and joint problem solving.

A DOE administrator pointed to:

> The sharing of information and reports, advance notice of conferences and meetings, co-support for major initiatives such as Commonwealth Futures, and the fact that we both bend our rules so we can work together.

Indeed, the range of cooperative efforts is impressive considering that there was very little joint work in the past. Examples of collaboration at the state level include the following:

- creation and continued existence of the YCC;
- joint participation in writing, reviewing proposals and evaluating Eight Percent projects;
- co-funding of the four Youth Demonstration Projects from 1984-86, three of which eventually became Commonwealth Futures sites;
- Commonwealth Futures initiatives;
- Adult Workplace Education projects;
- matching of Chapter 188 with Eight Percent funds in some projects;
- use of Eight Percent money to fund some positions at DOE;
- joint funding of programs for pregnant/parenting teens along with the Welfare Department;
- detailed review process of the new state Voc Ed plan, which gives OTEP a chance to influence the plan;
- changes in JTPA eligibility (allowing youth to be seen as a family of one) standards which makes it easier to have programs in schools.

Furthermore, there is much more information sharing among agencies, and people have developed personal networks with their counterparts in other agencies, a factor which greatly facilitates communication. More and more, people in different agencies are 'talking the same language.'

Coordination at the Local Level

There was general agreement among those interviewed that collaboration at the local level was spotty, with strong relationships between JTPA and Voc Ed in some SDAs but rather weak ties in others. (Two respondents, however, claimed that there was much more going on at the local level than was generally realized.) All agreed that CCs participate in a more meaningful way in JTPA training than they did in the past. Not only are facilities and programs being used more, but CCs are seen as more than just vendors, as they were in CETA days. Instead, they are much more likely to be involved in joint planning efforts. The CCs are viewed as entrepreneurial, flexible institutions which can tie into JTPA fairly easily. The schools are seen as more difficult to work with, in part because of their location and the difficulties of scheduling courses. Some SDAs have developed good ties to those schools, but others have not.

Officials interviewed would like to see collaboration occur at the local level in a much more comprehensive way. One suggested that all PICs have a permanent education committee that could provide a meaningful review of Voc Ed and other plans. Others believed that local areas need to set up articulated sequences of programs (including systems of accepting course credit) among JTPA and Voc Ed institutions.

Factors Producing Effective Coordination

A variety of factors were identified that have helped produce more effective coordination between JTPA and Voc Ed:

- leadership from the top--almost all respondents stressed that the push by top officials (the Governor, Raynolds, Alviani, Jennifer, Kathy Dunham, etc.) was critical to the improvement that has occurred in trying to coordinate the two systems;

- funding cuts which force agencies to work together in order to maximize resources;

- demographic factors--the decline in student enrollments--which push school administrators to reach out to non-traditional student to justify their programs and facilities;

- new laws which mandate cooperation;

- effectiveness of the YCC in bringing people together at the state level, and its effectiveness in stimulating local collaboration through the RFP process;

- growing sensitivity among many vocational administrators to the needs of the disadvantaged.

Factors Hindering Coordination

The following factors which hinder cooperation between the two systems were singled out:

- The two systems have different structures and somewhat different missions. ("We are fumbling around to see how we can mesh two systems that aren't structured in a way that is easy to put together.") JTPA is an exclusively federal program for the disadvantaged run by an agency that is directly accountable to the Governor. The Voc Ed system is largely funded by state and local monies and is accountable to local school committees and boards of education/regents who are one step removed from the political process. Voc Ed has to serve a wide range of students, not just those targeted as being disadvantaged.

- Many schools have difficulty with performance-based contracting that is required in most JTPA programs.

- It is sometimes difficult to use Voc-Tech schools because of scheduling and transportation problems.

- There is a history of two separate cultures, and there was no particular interest in collaboration in the past from top policymakers in the systems.

- Personalities and personal views of territoriality (turf) interfere with coordination efforts.

- There is a natural bias whereby staff people at all levels in one agency have difficulty seeing the driving and constraining forces that affect people in a different angency.

- There is tension as a result of the fact that Perkins money can be used as a match for JTPA money, but JTPA money cannot be used as a match for Perkins.

- The fact that other agencies are required to have some input into the state Voc Ed plan, but there is no reciprocal requirement about interagency input into the JTPA plan creates an obstacle to genuine cooperation.

Final Comments and Observations

There was universal agreement among the respondents that the process initiated by DOE this year in soliciting reviews of the state Voc Ed plan by other agencies was a very significant step forward in coordinating the two systems. One OTEP official called it "Extraordinary. I have never seen anything like that in any state agency."

There was no sentiment to merge agencies. All felt that bureaucratic reorganization or the creation of an education/training mega-agency was not worth the effort. Instead, everyone believes that there are a number of workable models of collaboration among agencies already, and these types of programs should be replicated and expanded.

All officials interviewed "spoke the same language" about the goals of coordination. No one supports the idea of coordination for its own sake; instead, all are very results-oriented. They believe strongly that coordination should take place around a practical, concrete problem that can be solved through joint action with measurable results. Further, all of those interviewed believed that coordination must include joint planning. And all of the respondents spoke in client-centered language. That is, joint planning, information sharing, and co-funding arrangements

should occur only if clients' lives (rather than organizations' status) are improved as a result.

Recommendations for Change from State Level Officials

The followig recommendations emerged from the interviews (not all of these were mentioned by all respondents):

- The Governor, the Massachusetts Board of Education, and other top officials should constantly support inter-agency co-operation and seek tasks around which people can coalesce. They must keep saying it and enforcing it.

- Insofar as it is possible, both Perkins money and Eight Percent JPTA money shuold be used as levers for institutional change within systems and between systems.

- The SJTCC should be reconstituted as a viable body.

- Top level officials in OTEP and DOE (along with other agencies) should collaborate on a major new initiative which is co-funded by them.

- There should be reciprocal review of the JTPA plan by DOE and other agencies.

- PICs should have a permanent Education Committee if they do not already have one.

- Some state money is needed for schools to receive "up-front" in order to help them fund JTPA programs which require performance contracting.

- DOE regional staff funded from Eight Percent money need to work more closely with SDA offices.

- The YCC should have a clearer sense of its priorities and should have some representatives who work directly with disadvantaged youth.

- Representatives from Voc Ed schools and CCs need to be more integrated into PICs if they are not already. A more comprehensive local planning process is needed that will allow students/clients to move more easily from one training or education component to another.

Comparative View: State and Regional Findings

In interviewing regional staff, this study hoped to gain the perspective of those who link the state and local systems. In fact, regional staff from both OTEP and DOE expressed more qualified views of current and potential coordination efforts than did state level respondents. State level agency staff were largely optimistic abut the direction in which coordination is moving, and the potential for state leadership and policy interventions to encourage local level coordination.

OTEP regional staff were generally optimistic about local coordination, but expressed reservations about the extent to which state policy initiatives could bring this about. Their role was clearly delineated: communicating information and incentives from the State to the SDAs, within the limits of their very decentralized system. It did not appear that state agency staff looked to regional managers for information on SDAs' coordination perceptions, priorities or needs.

All DOE regional respondents but one were somewhat pessimistic about current and potential coordination. They saw a need for more fundamental structural and attitudinal changes in both systems than state level staff described. Their pessimism may to some extent reflect their sense of being overlooked and by-passed within their own system. DOE regional staff, in some areas, have provided one of the few links between SDAs and the Voc Ed community, even if their current and potential coordination roles are not acknowledged by either agency.

However, important common attitudes about coordination emerged across state and regional levels at both OTEP and DOE:

- client-centered views;
- belief building in interagency working relationships at all levels;

- priority on coordinating resources around specific programmatic initiatives and targeted populations;

- emphasis on sharing information and workable models for coordination.

CHAPTER FOUR

OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION

As discussed in the Introduction to this report, the main purpose of the Council's study was to further the coordination dialogue which is emerging between Voc Ed and JTPA systems at the state level and in many localities. In the Council's view, this study's primary contribution is the data on local coordination perceptions and practices presented in Chapter One. It is hoped that each local and state administrator will find in that chapter data to inform his or her own efforts. The survey process in itself was designed to provoke thinking, to raise questions and to test some generalizations about what factors are encouraging and hindering coordination, and about present needs and possible future directions and coordination.

This chapter will attempt briefly to draw some conclusions from local survey findings, along with comments from state and regional EOEA and DOE staff as to the adequacy and effectiveness of current levels of coordination. It will focus on findings which offer direction for state efforts to facilitate local Voc Ed/JTPA coordination practices.

With all the limitations of a 53% survey response rate, some useful information was drawn out in the study. Chapter One offered a comparative view of local Voc Ed and JTPA administrators' concepts of coordination, encouraging and discouraging factors, costs and benefits. It identified local activities judged more or less desirable for coordination, as well as state policy measures seen as most and least likely to facilitate local coordination.

Yet, it should be emphasized that for all survey elements what is reported is an average for each sector. The necessary caution is that this composite will not always accurately reflect the needs, perceptions and views of individual administrators in each local area. Responses, for example, confirmed that the levels of commitment local SDAs and Voc Ed institutions have already made to coordinated planning and services with the other sector ranged widely from almost no communication to extensive joint planning and programming.

Priority Directions for Coordination

Local SDA respondents expressed somewhat less discontent with the nature and effectiveness of current local level coordination practices than did Voc Ed respondents. Similarly, regional OTEP staff expressed more optimism about the direction in which coordination is presently moving than regional DOE staff. It is important also to differentiate views and motivations among different kinds of Voc Ed institutions: CC presidents were the most satisfied with current SDA relationships, while RTVSs were least satisfied.

All Voc Ed sectors (i.e. COMPHSs, CTY/INDs, RVTSs, and CCs) judged current levels of coordination to be largely ineffective for meeting local training needs, while SDAs found coordination to be slightly more than moderately effective. One interpretation of this finding is that many Voc Ed institutions--including CCs--feel more need to pursue coordination than do most SDAs, who see it as a less essential pursuit. However, given SDAs' central responsibility for meeting employment training needs and Voc Ed's more peripheral involvement in training in most localities, it is to be expected that SDAs would rate the current situation more satisfactory and effective. The fact that

they rated these only moderate, on or near the middle of the scale, suggests considerable motivation and willingness on the part of most SDAs to pursue coordination with Voc Ed.

This study did not attempt to distinguish between qualitative attributes of "coordinated," "collaborative," or "cooperative" behavior, as some have. It started from the assumption that coordination is always an ideal state best defined by those who are working to achieve it, for whom it is but one tool for improving the effectiveness of their services to students and clients. In systems as decentralized as JTPA and Voc Ed, there is room for a wide range of different local visions of coordination.

Yet, virtually all visions of effective local coordination were found to include improved communications, information sharing and ongoing dialogue. There is clear consensus across sectors that channels for regular dialogue between Voc Ed institutions and the local SDA/PIC are necessary preconditions for coordination. Beyond this, there is enough disagreement within and across sectors on optimal focus, modes and components of coordination to suggest that it would not be productive for state agencies more clearly to 'define' coordination, as a few local respondents suggested.

Focusing State Support on Local Coordination Efforts

Two important distinctions about coordination emerged from the local survey. First, it is important to distinguish coordinated activities which aim only at increasing Voc Ed participation in delivering employment training services from activities which include them in joint planning. Voc Ed institutions from all sectors reported that they view coordination as a means to gain opportunities to participate in local employment training planning--not simply as a means

to increase their delivery of services to JTPA clients.

Second, it is essential to consider whether planned policy initiatives promote coordinated planning around one specific proposal or activity, or whether they in some way increase local systems' capacity to institutionalize a coordinated planning process. Certainly, working together to meet proposal requirements for joint planning and implementation can fuel coordination or encourage future efforts where good working relationships exist. But, policy initiatives which aim to promote more ongoing and systemic coordination must address 'worst case' as well as 'best case' relationships and not assume that joint planning relations will automatically be institutionalized.

The state policy emphasis on coordination around practical, concrete problems reported in state level interviews addresses some important areas of JTPA/Voc Ed coordination. It does not, however, offer assistance to help local agencies develop their capacity to coordinate planning on an ongoing basis or in response to specific incentives. Local respondents are clearly influenced by state policy initiatives and state agency modeling of collaborative behavior; state leadership on coordination from the Governor, the YCC and the State Council on Vocational Education were named by local administrators as among the factors most encouraging coordination. But state initiatives did not always translate into effective or lasting local coordination, particularly where program priorities identified at the state level did not correspond to local coordination priorities.

In fact, personal relationships and client or student need were named by nearly all respondents as the primary factors driving local coordination. Coordination initiatives targeting specific issues or populations will go further to promote systemic local coordination when

they grow out of local priorities and when they offer assistance for developing channels for ongoing dialogue and planning. Proposal requirements for coordination must look beyond what is needed for planning and implementing a specific program and, where possible, should make funding available for investment in administrative staff time needed for working out coordinated JTPA/Voc Ed relationships. The Commonwealth Futures Dropout Prevention Initiative offers one useful model, creating a process that encourages local dialogue and builds local coordination capacity in communities at all levels of initial 'readiness' (although not one that affords the broadest base of planning input from the education community).

SDAs seemed most disposed to respond to direct state funding incentives for specific coordinated programs and to use this same method for soliciting local Voc Ed services. The RFP process does not, however, meet present coordination needs of Voc Ed institutions very well. They are more concerned with identifying places where their resources can serve local employment training planning and service needs-filling gaps and eliminating duplication. Furthermore, scarcity of resources was not identified by either SDAs or Voc Ed as a major factor encouraging coordination. In fact, local administrators indicated that staff reduction, in particular, made it less likely they could afford the time investment coordination requires. Agencies cannot assume that funding cuts will drive Voc Ed and JTPA systems to coordinate in the absence of other kinds of support.

For virtually all local respondents, the factors most hindering coordination were related to perceived differences in mission, roles and power, and to communication and information gaps. Wide agreement on "turf issues" as a major barrier suggests that present obstacles could be largely overcome through ongoing dialogue. The emphasis on "difficulty of communication/too may channels to go through" as a primary discouraging factor supports the conclusion that establishing effective local communication channels is an essential prerequisite for coordination.

Less subjective barriers include "differences in respective definitions of allowable services and/or budgetary items" and "staff and time demands." These factors limit coordination possibilities even in areas where effective channels and ongoing dialogue have taken root. These would be important factors for state policymakers to study, with a view to possible changes. It is encouraging that regulatory mandates like matching, eligibility, performance standards and performance-based contracting as well as geographical boundaries--all relatively intractable factors--were judged by local respondents to be only somewhat discouraging.

The one regulatory issue respondents at all levels found quite frustrating was the fact that Perkins funding can be used to match for JTPA, while JTPA funds do not qualify as a match for Perkins. This issue can only be addressed at the federal level in the context of the upcoming reauthorization of the Perkins Voc Ed Act.

Voc Ed Service Delivery to JTPA

This study did not seek to gather data on the extent to which Voc Ed institutions are currently delivering JTPA funded services. It would have been a very difficult task, given that there is no indicator in the JTPA management information system which delineates each client's primary service provider. Although far from conclusive, the study identified some general patterns: most SDAs reported contracting with at least one Voc Ed institution, usually to serve an annual total of one to five clients from JTPA Title IIA, core funds.

There was not complete geographic congruence between SDA and Voc Ed respondents, and the majority of Voc Ed respondents in all sectors, except CCs, reported they received no JTPA funding and served no JTPA clients in PY 1986. The majority of CCs served 51-250 JTPA clients and administered funds ranging between $50,000 and $100,000. The secondary Voc Ed institutions which had served JTPA clients in PY 1986 (approximately a quarter of them) served fewer than 250 clients, averaging $10,000-$50,000 total funding. Voc Ed institutions reported having served more Summer Youth (Title IIB) clients than Title IIA. This amount will undoubtedly increase considerably for PY 1987 with the new requirement that JTPA Summer Youth programs include academic remediation.

Voc Ed institutions reported providing a much wider range of services to JTPA than SDAs reported receiving. Voc Ed reported providing assessment, vocational exploration, job readiness training, a range of academic skills including bilingual education, referrals, job development and follow-up, in addition to the staff, space, equipment, classroom occupational skill training and GED preparation that SDAs reported.

This finding seems to indicate a lack of information on the part of many SDAs as to services Voc Ed can and does provide.

This information gap very likely influenced SDA perceptions of how well Voc Ed program offerings meet local JTPA client needs and the range of clients they can effectively serve. (SDAs focused on JTPA services to youth.) SDAs also suggested broader kinds of changes they believe Voc Ed institutions need to make to enable them to serve JTPA clients. All Voc Ed sectors identified a much wider variety of services and a greater diversity of client populations they serve or believe they could serve well and relatively few needed changes--mostly due to limited resources and conflicting missions.

SDAs and CCs participated much more in activities funded through the Eight Percent Education Coordination Grants than secondary Voc Ed institutions. Many secondary Voc Ed respondents stated that they had not known of opportunities to work with the SDA on developing an Eight Percent proposal. Eight Percent funds served the intended function of promoting broad-based local JTPA coordination with education in some local areas where the planning committees, originally established to comply with Eight Percent RFP requirements, envolved into permanent education committees.

Participation in Planning and Information Exchange

This survey examined the extent to which SDAs and Voc Ed institutions carry out three kinds of coordination activities mandated by the Perkins Act and JTPA and five other local activities promoting exchange of information. The survey results indicate formal planning mandates in themselves do little to assure effective communication.

Mandated reviews of Perkins applications and provision to the PICs of Perkins program listings were described as pro forma where they were recognized at all. Gaps in perception of inclusion emerged as an important adjunct to gaps in coordination practices. For example, SDAs reported including Voc Ed institutions in their planning process and in their regular mailings far more than Voc Ed institutions believed they had been included.

Only a few SDAs, schools or colleges reported that they had adopted institutional criteria for coordination or had identified staff specifically responsible for coordination, both of which are indicators of a more proactive approach to coordination. The extent to which local agencies can make coordination an explicit part of their institutional mission and can commit staff to carrying this out is severely constrained by limits on staff resources and by competing priorities. It must also be acknowledged that some Voc Ed institutions have incorporated staff and resource demands related to participation in employment training planning and service delivery without reorganizing their staff or explicitly changing their institutional mission.

Membership Potential and Limitations

Exchange of members between Voc Ed and SDAs--on the PIC Executive Board and PIC Committee as well as on Voc Ed Advisory Committee--offers additional channels for information exchange and planning input. Membership on PIC Boards is widely perceived by schools and colleges as their best potential channel for input into the local employment training system, and nearly all CCs reported they are represented on PICs, as did almost half of RVTS respondents and a third of COMPHSs. Nearly every institution surveyed had made at least one attempt to gain PIC membership.

However, there are severe practical limitations on the number of Voc Ed institutions that can expect to serve on the PIC. Perhaps even more important, PIC Board membership in itself has limited capacity to develop the kind of dialogue that effective local coordination requires--dialogue which addresses specific problems, needs and resources and which involves the Voc Ed and SDA staff who carry out coordinated activities as well as superintendents, presidents, and directors.

Given the current wide interest in coordination and the perception that it can be beneficial to SDAs and Voc Ed institutions, it is counterproductive to focus on PIC membership as the primary indicator of an institution's commitment. Failure to gain a seat on the PIC Board must not continue to be perceived as an insurmountable obstacle to Voc Ed participation in the local employment training system.

State agencies and local institutions need to shift their focus for promoting coordination away from the PIC toward more broad-based education and planning committees. In some areas, such committees exist under PIC sponsorship, with membership and roles more broadly or more narrowly defined. These are likely to be the most appropriate vehicles for promoting expanded, direct Voc Ed participation in employment training planning, although in some locales, targeted sub-committees of broader human service coordination groups or a Commonwealth Futures planning group might be potentially more effective. SDA participation in Voc Ed general and program advisory committees is another important point of linkage for the two systems and opportunity for learning about each other's strengths and needs.

Most Desirable Local and State Coordination Activities

Responses from Chapter One, Section F and from regional staff indicate that most SDAs and Voc Ed institutions hold very similar agendas for at least initial stages of local coordination. There was wide consensus across agencies at both regional and local levels on the desirability and feasibility of coordinated information sharing on state and local labor markets, formal interagency financial and nonfinancial agreements, reciprocal referral procedures, joint technical assistance and joint funding of programs. There was also consensus among state, regional and local respondents that bureaucratic reorganization--developing jointly staffed agencies or joint intake, assessment and evaluation procedures--would not be desirable or feasible avenues for pursuing coordination.

State Intervention: Facilitation and Leadership

The essence of this report's message is that commitment to JTPA/Voc Ed coordination must come from the bottom-up as well as the top-down. It can be encouraged or facilitated by state level policy interventions, but must build on local commitment. Survey responses indicate that there is some degree of commitment to improving coordination in nearly all localities. However, state agencies must first offer local Voc Ed and JTPA agencies support for establishing or developing dialogue. Communication channels do not always appear to be in place to foster dialogue, which virtually all respondents named as an essential vehicle for coordination.

State leadership on coordination is essential, but it cannot focus only on developing policy initiatives and interagency working relationships at the state level. Administrators believe the State could most effectively assist their local coordination efforts. To effectively promote coordination at the local level, state level interventions must be responsive to input from the regional and local administrators who are actually responsible for making Voc Ed/JTPA coordination work.

CHAPTER FIVE

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

After analysis of this study's extensive findings, the Council developed a set of seven recommendations for state and local policy actions to improve JTPA/Voc Ed Coordination.

1. The Council recommends that the Executive Office of Economic Affairs (EOEA) and the Department of Education (DOE) offer funding to at least three local SDA/Voc Ed administrator teams which have developed successful modes for coordinating funding, programming or planning. These funds would be for the purpose of developing printed coordination resource and peer training workshop guides to disseminate information on effective practices.

2. The Council recommends that EOEA and DOE continue to use part of the 20% administrative portion of the Eight Percent Education Coordination funding to fund staff who can link the two systems. These staff should be attached to Voc Ed institutions and SDAs rather than to the DOE regional office. The roles and responsibilities of these staff (for technical assistance, facilitation, etc.) should be determined by local Voc Ed and JTPA administrators in each region. Regional coordination staff should be included on planning committees, developing all state initiatives concerning coordination.

3. EOEA and DOE should use funding proposal criteria and local plan requirements wherever possible to encourage involvement of local Education/Planning Committees (likely to be PIC-sponsored). The EOEA and DOE should investigate possibilities for incorporating processes for facilitating ongoing local dialogue between Voc Ed institutions and JTPA into funding procedures, such as the Commnwealth Futures model for local planning and technical assistance.

4. A portion of funding from JTPA and Perkins funds should be made available to support the development and articulation of open-entry/open-exit program and support services for JTPA client populations.

5. CLEECC should examine possibilities for state EOEA and DOE assistance to alleviate identified barriers to coordination including:

- differences in respective definitions of allowable services and/or budgetary items;
- need for increased staff or reduced time demands for coordinating planning and service delivery;
- possibilities for developing reciprocal referral procedures;
- possibilities for streamlining administration and reporting for jointly funded programs.

6. Local SDA review of Voc Ed Perkins funding application should be strengthened, and Voc Ed institutions should be encouraged to provide listings of their program offerings to the SDA/PIC. SDAs should be encouraged to solicit the input of Voc Ed institutions in the development of the local employment training plan, while state JTPA and Voc Ed Plan development should build-in reciprocal review (as the Voc Ed planning process has done).

7. SDAs should be encouraged to review their PIC Board and Committee membership, with particular attention to the breadth of Voc Ed participation and planning roles in Education/Planning Committees. Voc Ed institutions should be encouraged to consider including SDA/PIC representation on General or Program Advisory Committees.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN LOCAL LEVEL SURVEY

SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS

--Boston
--Brockton
--Berkshire (Pittsfield)
--Cambridge
--Fall River
--Franklin/Hampshire (Greenfield)
--Massachusetts (Gardner)
--South Coastal (N. Quincy)

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

--Bristol Community College
--Bunker Hill Community College
--Greenfield Community College
--Holyoke Community College
--Massasoit Community College
--Middlesex Community College
--North Shore Community College
--Northern Essex Community College
--Quinsigamond Community College

REGIONAL VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SCHOOLS

--Blue Hills Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Bristol-Plymouth Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Cape Cod Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Essex Agricultural School
--Franklin County Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Greater Lawrence Vocational-Technical School
--Greater Lowell Vocational-Technical School
--Joseph P.Keefe Vocational-Technical School
--Minuteman Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Massachusetts Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Northern Bershire Vocational School
--North Shore Regional Vocational-Technical School
--Old Colony Vocational-Technical School
--Pathfinder Regional Vocational-School
--South Worcester County Vocational-Techniccal School
--Whittier Vocational School

INDEPENDENT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

--Lawrence Vocational School
--Northampton-Smith Vocational School
--Worcester Trade Complex

CITY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

--Dean Vocational-Technical School (Holyoke)
--Everett Vocational High School
--Humphrey Occupational Resource Center (Boston)
--Leominster Trade School
--William O. Peabody High School (Norwood)
--Salem Vocational High School
--Weymouth Vocational-Technical School

COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS WITH DIRECTORS OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

--Brookline High School
--Cambridge Rindge & Latin High School
--Chicopee Comprehensive High School
--Drury Senior High School (North Adams)
--Framingham Public Schools
--Melrose High School
--New Bedford Public Schools
--Claude H. Patton Vocational High School
--Watertown Public Schools
--Worcester Public Schools

APPENDIX B

RECENT SDA/VOC ED RELATIONSHIP CHANGES REPORTED

SDA

-2 SDAs cited greater contacts with CCs and one with Voc-Tech Schools.
-2 SDAs observed that participation in Commonwealth Futures Dropout Prevention effort has brought closer contact with local public schools systems.
-1 SDA cited "numerous cooperative efforts in literacy, dislocated workers, Welfare, E.T., and skills training.

CC

-2 CCs stated that they have recently had more contact with PICs, one through membership of the college president and one through participation in monthly PIC meetings.
-2 CCs reported recent collaboration with PICs on Summer Youth programs, and one on Adult Basic Literacy Programs.
-1 CC cited a downturn in its planning input to the PIC, which has turned increasingly to the City Vocational School.

RVTS

-2 RVTSs cited recent appointment of their superintendent to the PIC; one other has been invited to PIC Education Sub-Committee Meetings. One Regional Voc-Tech reported that its new superintendent is actively seeking PIC membership, although the previous superintendents were refused appointment.
-2 RVTSs reported starting to deliver services by contract to the PIC over the past 2-3 years; one other reported that recent overtures were refused due to PIC funding cuts.
-2 RVTSs reported active efforts and discussions with PICs currently underway.

CTY/IND

-1 CTY/IND reported that it has begun serving as a site for the Summer Youth Program.
-2 CTY/INDs reported recent negative contacts; one participated in a school/college/community partnership which the PIC would not fund to do adult skill training; one reported that it received no comment on Perkins proposals submitted to the PIC.

COMPHS

-1 COMPHS reported recent membership on a PIC Board.
-2 COMPHSs reported ongoing and improving relations with the PIC.
-1 COMPHS has a Summer Program co-funded by Perkins and JTPA.

APPENDIX C

VOC ED REPORTS ON JTPA CLIENTS SERVED
(By Type of Institution and by Funding Title)

Please note that cumulative category totals for all these tables (Title IIA + Title IIB + 8% Education Coordination) do not always correspond to JTPA total figures (which were first totalled numerically). 'N' is also different across categories because of 'no comment' responses.

TABLE C1: VOC ED REPORT OF JTPA TITLE IIA CLIENTS

# Clients	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
1000+	0	0	0	0
501-1000	0	0	0	0
251-500	0	0	0	0
51-250	1	1	0	0
11-50	0	1	0	2
1-10	1	1	0	0
-0-	10	5	8	6
	(N = 12)	(N = 8)	(N = 8)	(N = 8)

TABLE C2: VOC ED REPORT OF JTPA TITLE IIB CLIENTS

# Clients	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
1000+	0	0	0	0
501-1000	0	0	0	0
251-500	0	0	0	1
51-250	1	0	2	1
11-50	1	0	2	1
1-10	0	0	0	0
-0-	10	10	5	5
	(N = 12)	(N = 10)	(N = 9)	(N = 8)

TABLE C3: VOC ED REPORT OF EIGHT PERCENT FUND CLIENTS

# Client	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
1000+	0	0	0	0
501-1000	0	0	0	0
251-500	0	0	0	0
51-250	1	0	2	1
11-50	1	0	0	1
1-10	0	0	0	1
-0-	10	0	7	5
	(N = 12)	(N = 10)	(N = 9)	(N = 8)

APPENDIX D

VOC ED REPORTS ON FUND DISTRIBUTION

TABLE D1: VOC ED REPORT OF PY '86 TITLE IIA JTPA FUND AMOUNTS

Amount	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
$250,001-500,000	0	1	0	0
$100,001-250,000	0	0	0	0
$50,001-100,000	1	0	0	2
$10,001-50,000	0	3	0	0
$5,001-10,000	0	0	0	0
$1-5,000	0	0	0	0
-0-	10	5	9	6
	(N = 11)	(N = 9)	(N = 9)	(N = 8)

TABLE D2: VOC ED REPORT OF PY '86 TITLE IIB JTPA FUND AMOUNTS

Amount	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
$250,001-500,000	0	0	0	1
$100,001-250,000	0	0	1	0
$50,001-100,000	1	0	1	1
$10,001-50,000	1	0	1	1
$5,001-10,000	0	0	1	0
$1-5,000	0	0	0	0
-0-	10	10	4	5
	(N = 12)	(N = 10)	(N = 8)	(N = 8)

TABLE D3: VOC ED REPORT OF PY '86 EIGHT PERCENT FUND AMOUNTS

Amount	RVTS	CTY/IND	COMPHS	CC
$250,001-500,000	0	0	0	0
$100,001-250,000	1	0	1	0
$50,001-100,000	0	0	0	1
$10,001-50,000	1	0	1	0
$5,001-10,000	0	0	0	0
$1-5,000	0	0	0	1
-0-	10	10	7	5
	(N = 12)	(N = 10)	(N = 9)	(N = 7)

APPENDIX E

SERVICES VOC ED INSTITUTIONS SUPPLIED TO JTPA

Services are listed below in the order of frequency with which they were reported by each type of institution.

Table E1: Administration and Support Services

CC

1. General Administration
2. Referrals
3. Space
4. Equipment
5. Personnel/Staff
6. Intake/Vocational Assessment
7. Transportation
8. Counseling
9. Job Search and Placement
10. Tracking/Follow-up
11. Credit
12. Job Development
13. Funding

RVTS

1. General Administration
2. Space
3. Personnel/Staff
4. Job Development
5. Equipment
6. Referrals
7. Counseling
8. Tracking/Follow-up
9. Credit
10. Transportation
11. Job Search and Placement
12. Funding
13. Intake/Vocational Assessment

CTY/IND

1. Space
2. Referrals
3. General Administration
4. Equipment
5. Counseling
6. Personnel/Staff
7. Job Development
8. Job Search and Placement
9. Credit
10. Funding
11. Intake/Vocational Assessment
12. Tracking/Follow-up

(Table E1 continued)

COMPHS

1. Personnel/Staff
2. Credit
3. Referrals
4. Intake/Vocational Assessment
5. Space
6. Equipment
7. Funding
8. Counseling
9. General Administration
10. Transportation
11. Job Development
12. Job Search and Placement
13. Tracking/Follow-up
14. Daycare

Note that only one Voc Ed institution reported providing Daycare.

Table E2: Instructional Services

CC

1. Classroom Occupational Skills Training
2. Basic Academic Skills Training
3. GED Preparation
4. Bilingual Education/Training
5. Vocational Exploration
6. Employability/Job Readiness
7. On-the-Job Training
8. Customized Training
9. Work or Cooperative Experience
10. English as a Second Language

RVTS

1. Classroom Occupational Skills Training
2. Vocational Exploration
3. Employability/Job Readiness
4. Work or Cooperative Experience
5. Basic Academic Skills Training
6. On-the-Job Training
7. GED Preparation
8. Bilingual Education/Training
9. Customized Training

CTY/IND

1. Classroom Occupational Skills Training
2. Basic Academic Skills Training
3. GED Preparation
4. Bilingual Education/Training
5. Employability/Job Readiness
6. Vocational Exploration
7. Work or Cooperative Experience
8. On-the-Job Training
9. Vocational Laboratory

COMPHS

1. Classroom Occupational Skills Training
2. Basic Academic Skills Training
3. Vocational Exploration
4. Employability/Job Readiness
5. Work or Cooperative Experience
6. Bilingual Education/Training
7. GED Preparation
8. On-the-Job Training
9. Customized Training

APPENDIX F

DESIRABLE LOCAL LEVEL COORDINATION

1 (not at all) - 5 (Very)

SDA — ACTIVITY	$\bar{X}$
Sharing local labor market information	4.6
Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.5
Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	4.1
Joint funding of programs	3.6
Joint operation of programs	3.4
Joint/reciprocal staff development	3.4
Joint preparation of local service plans	3.4
Joint follow-up activities on students/clients	2.9
Joint program evaluation	2.8
Joint intake & assessment procedures	2.1
CC	
Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.6
Sharing local labor market information	4.4
Joint or reciprocal staff development	4.4
Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	4.4
Joint preparation of local service plans	4.2
Joint follow-up activities on students/clients	4.0
Joint funding of programs	3.9
Joint program evaluation	3.8
Joint intake & assessment procedures	3.6
Joint operation of programs	3.0
RVTS	
Sharing local labor market information	4.2
Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.2
Joint funding of programs	3.7
Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	3.6
Joint follow-up activities on students/clients	3.6
Joint operation of programs	3.5
Joint preparation of local service plans	3.5
Joint program evaluation	3.5
Joint intake & assessment procedures	3.4
Joint or reciprocal staff development	3.3
CTY/IND	
Sharing local labor market information	4.6
Joint preparation of local service plans	4.1
Reciprocal referral procedures for participants	4.0
Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	3.6
Joint funding of programs	3.4
Joint program evaluation	3.4
Joint follow-up activities on students/clients	3.3
Joint or reciprocal staff development	3.1
Joint intake & assessment procedures	3.0

ACTIVITY COMPHS	$\bar{X}$
Joint funding of programs	4.7
Sharing local labor market information	4.6
Joint operation of programs	4.4
Joint or reciprocal technical assistance	4.4
Joint follow-up activities on students/clients	4.4
Reciprocal referral procedures	4.4
Joint or reciprocal staff development	4.3
Joint program evaluation	4.3
Joint intake & assessment procedures	4.0
Joint preparation of local service plans	3.9

APPENDIX G

STATE AND REGIONAL INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Department of Education

State Policymakers:

Commissioner Harold Raynolds, Jr.
David F.Cronin, Associate Commissioner of Occupational Education
Frank Llamas, Director, Education and Employment Bureau
Phyillis Lary, Director, Postsecondary Bureau

Regional Education Training and Employment Specialists:

Eleanor Andrade
John Bynoe
George Cravins
Mimi Jones

Executive Office of Economic Affairs

State Policymakers:

Undersecretary Eric Van Loon
Catherine N. Stratton, OTEP Associate Secretary
Maria Grigorieff, Director, OTEP Planning and Evaluation
Cecilia Rivera-Casales, OTEP Planner

OTEP Regional Managers:

Katherine Carroll Day
Jon Koppelman
Duncan Parker